

Volume XXXIII

MAY, 1918

Number 5

MAY 6 1918

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

EDITED BY

JAMES WILSON BRIGHT, Editor-in-Chief  
MURRAY PEABODY BRUSH      GUSTAV GRUENBAUM  
WILLIAM KURRELMAYER

## CONTENTS

FRENCH, JOHN C.—Poe and the 'Baltimore Saturday Visiter,'	257
JENKINS, T. ATKINSON—Deschamps' Ballade to Chaucer,	268
BLONDHEIM, D. S.—"The Devil and Doctor Foster,"	278
KURRELMAYER, W.—Nachtrag zur Wieland-Bibliographie,	282

### Reviews:—

SIR SIDNEY COLVIN, John Keats: his Life and Poetry, his Friends, Critics, and After-Fame. [ <i>Martha Hale Shackford.</i> ]	293
LUDWIG LEWISOHN, The Spirit of Modern German Literature. [ <i>John Whyte.</i> ]	297
AMY LOWELL, Tendencies in Modern American Poetry. [ <i>James W. Tupper.</i> ]	300
E. C. HILLS and J. D. M. FORD, First Spanish Course. [ <i>Samuel M. Waxman.</i> ]	304

### Correspondence:—

CHEW, SAMUEL C.—Byroniana,	306
WOODBRIDGE, BENJ. M.—A Motto of Mérimée's,	309
KING, GEORGIANA G.—A Note on <i>Lycidas</i> ,	310
PEROTT, JOSEPH DE.—The Spanish Idiom <i>fondo en</i> . . . .	311
ADAMS, JOSEPH QUINCY.—A Ben Jonson Allusion Book,	311
BAUM, PAULL F.—A Source,	312
BELDEN, H. M.—Seyld Seeling and Huck Finn,	315

### Brief Mention:—

BURGES JOHNSON, The Well of English, and the Bucket;—JOHN, VISCOUNT MORLEY, Recollections;—W. F. GIESE and BARRY CERF, Simplest Spoken French,	315
--	-----

THE JOHNS HOPKINS PRESS  
BALTIMORE

Eight Numbers a Year—Single Copy (Current) Forty Cents

Entered as Second-Class Matter at the Baltimore, Maryland, Postoffice

# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

A MONTHLY PUBLICATION with intermission from July to October (inclusive)

This publication is devoted to linguistic and literary research and to aesthetic and philosophic criticism in the domain of English, German, and the related Germanic Languages; and of French, Italian, Spanish, and the other Languages of the Romance Group. Its purpose is also to promote sound methods in the teaching of the Modern Languages and Literatures

The Subscription Price of the current annual volume is \$3.00 for the United States and Mexico; Canada \$3.25 and \$3.50 for other countries included in the Postal Union.

Contributors and Publishers will please address matter for the English Department of the *Notes* to James W. Bright; for the German Department to William Kurrelmeyer; for the French, Italian, and Spanish Departments to Murray P. Brush. Other matter may be sent to the Editor-in-Chief. The address of all the editors is Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

Subscriptions and other business communications should be sent to the Johns Hopkins Press, Baltimore, Md.

## PREPARATION OF COPY

All copy should be in typewritten form.

Underscore (for italics) all titles of books, periodicals, poems, plays and other separately published compositions.

Use numerals in designating foot-notes, and number foot-notes in unbroken sequence.

Use roman numerals for volume-reference, set off by a comma before a following page-reference.

## Oxford French Plain Texts

Under the general editorship of H. L. HUTTON  
Fcap 8vo (6½ x 4¾), limp cloth, pp. 48.

### Just Issued

**Gringoire;** Comédie en un acte en prose. Par Théodore de Banville..... 25c.

**La Grammaire;** Comédie Vaudeville. Par Eugène Labiche..... 20c.

**Le Voyage de Monsieur Perrichon.** Par Eugène Labiche..... 40c.

### Previously Issued

#### Paris Menacé, Paris Sauvé

Extraits de l'Histoire Anecdotique de la Guerre, par Franc-Nohain et Paul Delay, selected and edited by G. H. Clarke. Édition Autorisée..... 20c.

**Laurette,** ou Le Cachet Rouge. Par Alfred de Vigny..... 20c.

**Mateo Falcone, Le Coup de Pistolet;** deux contes par Prosper Mérimée .....

**Le Lac de Gers, Le Col d'Anterne;** deux contes par Rodolphe Töpffer .....

Complete catalogue upon request

OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS AMERICAN BRANCH



35 West 32nd Street,

NEW YORK



# MODERN LANGUAGE NOTES

VOLUME XXXIII

MAY, 1918

NUMBER 5

## POE AND THE BALTIMORE SATURDAY VISITER

In the three years that followed his dismissal from West Point, Edgar Allan Poe might well have disputed Hawthorne's claim to be the obscurest man of letters in America. Although he was the author of three published volumes of verse, Poe had made so slight an impression on his times that the most diligent of biographers have had difficulty in learning where and how he spent these years. It begins to be clear that his residence during the whole period was Baltimore, and that, having put a military career behind him, he was striving without help or encouragement to be wholly a man of letters. He was rescued from obscurity by successful competition for a prize offered by a Baltimore weekly, devoted, in the phrase of the time, to polite literature. This paper was the *Baltimore Saturday Visiter*. It had been established early in 1832 by Mr. Charles F. Cloud, with Lambert A. Wilmer, a friend of Poe, as editor. By the end of the year Mr. Cloud had taken a partner, William P. Pouder, and Wilmer had been succeeded as editor by John H. Hewitt. In the summer of 1833 the *Visiter* announced an offer of two prizes, one of fifty dollars for the best tale, and another of twenty-five dollars for the best poem submitted to them before October first. Poe competed for both prizes. His *MS. Found in a Bottle*, one of six *Tales of the Folio Club* which he sent in, won the fifty dollar prize as the best tale.<sup>1</sup> What was far more important, it brought him the friendship of John P. Kennedy, whose kindly help and encouragement came to Poe in a time of direst need.

No editor of Poe, so far as I am aware, has had access to a file of the *Visiter*, and it has been generally supposed<sup>1</sup> that no

<sup>1</sup> *The Complete Works of Edgar Allan Poe*, ed. by James A. Harrison, I, 307. *The Poems of Edgar Allan Poe*, ed. by Killis Campbell, p. 219.

such file had survived. I have recently been fortunate enough to learn that Volume III of the *Visiter* has been preserved by descendants of the proprietors, who have kindly permitted me to examine it. Besides affording first-hand information about the contest which proved so momentous in Poe's life, the volume contains one new poem undoubtedly by Poe and two more which are probably also his work.

## I

Our knowledge of the circumstances of the *Saturday Visiter's* prize contest has hitherto been somewhat legendary. The earliest misstatement in regard to it seems to have been made by R. W. Griswold in the "Ludwig Article" in the *New York Tribune* of October 9, 1849.<sup>2</sup> He gives the date as 1831, and invents details to the effect that Poe received the prize solely because he had written legibly, and that "not another ms. was unfolded." In 1875, when the monument to Poe erected through the efforts of teachers and pupils in the Baltimore public schools was to be dedicated, one of the three judges of the contest, Mr. J. H. B. Latrobe, was still living. He was asked to give his personal recollections of the poet. The address<sup>3</sup> which Mr. Latrobe delivered, on November 17, 1875, as a part of the dedication ceremony, was a circumstantial account of the award of the prizes, which gave the lie to Griswold's malicious inventions, and an interesting and valuable description of Poe as he appeared in an interview a few days later.

The winner of the prize for the best poem, Mr. John H. Hewitt,<sup>4</sup> was also living and was present at the dedication. In a volume of random reminiscences<sup>5</sup> which he published in 1877, he alludes to Mr. Latrobe's address, and gives his own account of the contest. Curiously enough he confirms Latrobe's error as to the amount of the prizes, which he says were one hundred dollars and fifty

<sup>2</sup> Harrison, I, 351.

<sup>3</sup> *Edgar Allan Poe. A Memorial Volume*, by Sara Sigourney Rice, Baltimore, 1877, p. 57.

<sup>4</sup> His name is misspelled by Whitty, *The Complete Poems of Edgar Allan Poe*, ed. by J. H. Whitty, p. xxxvii.

<sup>5</sup> *Shadows on the Wall or Glimpses of the Past*, by John H. Hewitt, Baltimore, 1877, pp. 39-43; 154-158.

dollars. From Hewitt's account it is apparent that the judges informed Poe that his poem *The Coliseum* would have received the twenty-five dollar prize if the larger prize had not already been awarded to him, and that the matter was the subject of some controversy between the two contestants. Hewitt alludes to this as a "little unpleasantry," and Gill in his life of Poe<sup>\*</sup> says that Poe tried, naturally in vain, to induce Hewitt to waive his claim to the honor but to keep the money. Hewitt and Poe had previously disagreed, as the result of a hostile review by Hewitt of Poe's Poems in 1829, and Hewitt's animus, though less vicious than Griswold's, is evident in every line that he has written about Poe.

Both Latrobe and Hewitt speak of the paper as the *Visitor*, and by various biographers it is spoken of as the *Saturday Morning Visitor*. Whatever it may have been called by later editors, the volume of 1833 was entitled the *Baltimore Saturday Visiter*. The offer of the prizes first appears in the issue of June 15, and is repeated without change at varying intervals until September 7. It reads as follows:

#### PREMIUMS

The proprietors of the *Baltimore Saturday Visiter* feeling desirous of encouraging literature, and at the same time serving their readers with the best that lies within their reach, offer a premium of *50 dollars* for the best Tale and *25 dollars* for the best Poem, not exceeding one hundred lines, that shall be offered them between the present period and the first of October next.

The following gentlemen have been chosen to decide on the merits of the productions:

John P. Kennedy, Esq.  
John H. B. Latrobe, Esq.  
Doctor James H. Miller

Those writers throughout the country who are desirous of entering the lists, will please forward their productions to *Cloud and Pouder*, Baltimore, before the first of October (postpaid) enclosed in an envelope bearing the name of the writer. If secrecy is preferred, the name may be enclosed in a separate envelope, which will not be opened, except in the case of the successful author. We wish those

\* *The Life of Edgar Allan Poe*, by William Fearing Gill, New York, 1877, pp. 69-70.

who may write for either of the premiums to understand that all manuscripts submitted will become the property of the Publishers.

\*\* Silver medals to the amount of the above rewards will be given in lieu of cash, if required.

The decision of the judges was announced in the *Visiter* of October 12. The text of the successful tale was not—as is asserted by various biographers—printed in this number, but in the issue of October 19. The announcement of the award is as follows:

#### THE PREMIUMS

It will be seen by the following letter that the Committee have decided on the merits of the various productions sent for the premiums offered by us. The "Manuscript found in a bottle" is the production of Edgar A. Poe, of Baltimore.

The poem entitled "The Song of the Winds" by Henry Wilton, of Baltimore.

The prize pieces shall be published next week.

Messers. Cloud and Pouder—

Gentlemen:—We have received two pacquets containing the Poems and Tales submitted as competitors for the prizes offered by you in July last, and in accordance with your request have carefully perused them with a view to the award of the premiums.

Amongst the poems we have selected a short one, entitled "Song of the Winds," as the most finished production offered. There were several others of such a degree of merit as greatly to perplex our choice and cause some hesitation in the award we have made.

Of the tales submitted there were many of various and distinguished excellence; but the singular force and beauty of those offered by "The Tales of the Folio Club," it may be said without disparagement to the high merit of others presented in the competition, left us no ground for doubt in making choice of one from that collection. We have accordingly, awarded the prize in this department to the tale bearing the title of "A MS Found in a Bottle." It would scarcely be doing justice to the author of this collection to say the tale we have chosen is the best of the six offered by him. We have read them all with unusual interest, and can not refrain from the expression of the opinion that the writer owes it to his own reputation, as well as to the gratification of the community to publish the whole volume. These tales are eminently distinguished by a wild, vigorous and poetical imagination, a rich style, a fertile invention, and varied and curious learning. Our selection of "A MS Found in a bottle" was rather dictated by the originality of its conception and its length, than by any superior merit in its execution over the others by the same author.

The general excellence of the whole of the compositions offered for the prizes is very creditable to the rising literature of our country.

Very Respectfully Gent'l'n

John P. Kennedy  
Jno. H. B. Latrobe  
J. H. Miller

Baltimore, October 7, 1833.

In the next number the poem and the tale were duly published.<sup>7</sup> The poem comes first, and, as in the report of the judges, is attributed to Henry Wilton. The use of a pseudonym is due, no doubt, to the fact that Hewitt was at the time editor of the *Visiter*. He prints *The Song of the Winds* as his own in the volume of reminiscences mentioned above.<sup>8</sup> The successful tale was printed under the prefatory note:

The following is the tale to which the Premium of Fifty Dollars has been awarded by the Committee. It will be found highly graphic in its style of composition.

A careful collation of the text of the *MS. Found in a Bottle*, undertaken for me by a former student, shows that this earliest version does not differ markedly from that printed in December, 1835, in the *Southern Literary Messenger*.<sup>9</sup> I give below those variants from the final text in the Harrison edition,<sup>10</sup> which are also variants from the text of the *Messenger* (the Harrison reading is given first in each case). In all other variations from the final text the *Visiter* and the *Messenger* are in agreement.

Page 2, l. 28, as well for its color as (as well as for its color); 3, l. 22, left me without deigning (went below without deigning); 4, l. 5, impossible to say (impossible for me to say); 4, l. 12, whirlpool of mountainous and foaming ocean within which we were engulfed (whirlpool or mountains and foaming ocean within which we are engulfed); 5, l. 25, gave out no light (emitted no light); 7, ll. 29, 30, slowly from the dim and horrible gulf beyond her

<sup>7</sup> In this issue there is a brief editorial comment in which occurs the remark, "It gives us great pleasure in stating for the literary credit of our city, that both the successful candidates are Baltimoreans."

<sup>8</sup> *Shadows on the Wall*, p. 157.

<sup>9</sup> Vol. II, p. 33.

<sup>10</sup> Harrison, II, 1, 307.

(slowly from the everlasting gulf beyond her); 7, l. 34, I know not (I knew not); 10, l. 20, of this kind (of the kinds); 12, l. 16, escapes to the only (escapes from imminent and deadly peril to the only); 12, l. 22, there is (there was); 12, l. 27, that is, about five feet (that is, I mean, about five feet).

That Poe took to heart the advice of the judges that he publish the volume of tales which he had submitted to them is proved by an announcement in the *Visiter* a week later.

#### THE FOLIO CLUB

This is the title of a volume of tales from the pen of Edgar A. Poe, the gentleman to whom the committee appointed by the proprietors of this paper awarded the premium of \$50. The work is about being put to press, and is to be published by subscription. We have a list at our office, and any person wishing to subscribe will please call. The volume will cost but \$1. ✓

The prize tale is not the best of Mr. Poe's productions; among the tales of the Folio Club there are many possessing uncommon merit. They are all characterized by a raciness, originality of thought and brilliancy of conception which are rarely to be met with in the writings of our most favored American authors. In assisting Mr. Poe in the publication of the Folio Club, the friends of native literature will encourage a young author whose energies have been partially damped by the opposition of the press, and, we may say, by the lukewarmness of the public in appreciating American productions. He has studied and written much—his reward rested on public approbation—let us give him something more substantial than bare praise. We ask our friends to come forward and subscribe to the work—there are many anxious to see it before the public.

In the next issue of the *Visiter* (that of November 2) the offer is withdrawn by the following note:

Mr. Poe has declined the publication of his Tales of the Folio Club in the manner stated in our last number. It is his intention, we understand, to bring them out in Philadelphia.

Later, on the advice of Mr. Kennedy, Poe sent the Tales to Carey and Lea, of Philadelphia,<sup>11</sup> in whose hands also they failed to reach publication as a collection.

<sup>11</sup> *The Life of Edgar Allan Poe*, by George E. Woodberry, Boston, 1909, 1, 100.

Besides the *MS. Found in a Bottle*, only two of the six tales sent to the *Visiter* have been identified. These two, according to a note in the *Southern Literary Messenger* for August, 1835,<sup>12</sup> were *Lionizing* and *The Visionary (The Assignation)*. Dr. Killis Campbell has pointed out<sup>13</sup> that five tales of the *Folio Club* were published during 1832 in the *Philadelphia Courier*. As the *Courier*, a periodical apparently somewhat similar to the *Visiter*, had offered in 1831 a prize of one hundred dollars for the best tale submitted before December 1 of that year, it is altogether probable, as Dr. Campbell conjectures, that Poe competed for this prize, and that after the award his tales were published, with or without his consent. The three known to have been sent to the *Visiter* are not among them. It had been stipulated by the proprietors of the *Visiter* that all manuscripts submitted in the contest should become the property of the paper. In the case of Poe's tales the right thus claimed seems not to have been insisted on. On October 26, however, one week after the appearance of Hewitt's poem, Poe's *The Coliseum* was published, without comment or allusion to the prize<sup>14</sup> for which it had been submitted. This version of *The Coliseum* presents two interesting variations from the later texts. It begins with the line,

Lone amphitheatre! Grey Coliseum!

which is lacking in the *Messenger* and in later versions. The second line of the fourth paragraph of the poem,

These mouldering plinths; this broken frieze,

is metrically faulty. In the *Messenger* version Poe expanded it into two lines, which he retained in successive revisions:

These mouldering plinths; these sad, and blackened shafts;  
These vague entablatures; this broken frieze;  
These shattered cornices . . .

In general, however, the text printed in the *Messenger* closely follows the original form.

<sup>12</sup> Vol. I, p. 716; cf. Woodberry, II, 401.

<sup>13</sup> *The Dial*, LX, 143 (February 17, 1916).

<sup>14</sup> In the *Southern Literary Messenger* for August, 1835 (I, 706), Poe entitles it *The Coliseum, A Prize Poem*.

## II

After the publication of *The Coliseum* the volume contains no contribution by Poe, nor any mention of his name except the announcement of the subscription edition of the tales. An examination of the earlier issues is more fruitful. In the *Visiter* for April 20, 1833, is a poem by Poe hitherto unknown, so far as I can learn, to his editors and biographers. It runs as follows:

## SERENADE.—BY E. A. POE.

So sweet the hour—so calm the time,  
I feel it more than half a crime  
When Nature sleeps and stars are mute,  
To mar the silence ev'n with lute.  
At rest on ocean's brilliant dies  
An image of Elysium lies:  
Seven Pleiades entranced in Heaven,  
Form in the deep another seven:  
Endymion nodding from above  
Sees in the sea a second love.  
Within the valleys dim and brown,  
And on the spectral mountain's crown  
The wearied light is dying down;  
The earth, and stars, and sea, and sky  
Are redolent of sleep, as I  
Am redolent of thee and thine  
Enthralling love, my Adeline.  
But list, O list— so soft and low  
Thy lover's voice tonight shall flow  
That, scarce awake, thy soul shall deem  
My words the music of a dream.  
Thus, while no single sound too rude,  
Upon thy slumber shall intrude,  
Our thoughts, our souls—O God above!  
In every deed shall mingle, love.

In imagery and in diction the *Serenade* is closely associated with the poems that Poe published in 1827 and 1829. Besides the usual atmosphere of strange light, fantastic stars, and half-waking

dreams, it makes use of some of the favorite words which pleased his ear at this time. With the second line,

I feel it more than half a crime,

compare the following passages peculiar to the 1827 version of *Tamerlane*:

To shun the fate with which to cope  
Is more than crime may dare to dream (ll. 4 and 5).

And bade it first to dream of crime (l. 149).

When falsehood wore a ten-fold crime (l. 190).

and these lines from *Romance* (1829) :

That little time with lyre and rhyme  
To while away—forbidden things!  
My heart would feel to be a crime  
Unless it trembled with the strings.

Poe was also fond of the epithet *dim*, in the line

Within the valleys dim and brown.

In *Irene*, the 1831 version of *The Sleeper*, the word is used three times, one line in which it occurs,

Nodding above the dim abyss,

being peculiar to that version. A still closer parallel occurs in *Fairy-Land* (line 41 of the 1831 version),

Dim vales! and shadowy floods!

Among the poems with which the columns of the *Visiter* are somewhat generously supplied are the two following, published in the late spring, which instantly arrest the attention.

To —————

Sleep on, sleep on, another hour—  
I would not break so calm a sleep,  
To wake to sunshine and to show'r,  
To smile and weep.

Sleep on, sleep on, like sculptured thing,  
Majestic, beautiful art thou;

Sure seraph shields thee with his wing  
And fans thy brow—

We would not deem thee child of earth,  
For, O, angelic is thy form!  
But, that in heav'n thou had'st thy birth,  
Where comes no storm

To mar the bright, the perfect flow'r,  
But all is beautiful and still—  
And golden sands proclaim the hour  
Which brings no ill.

Sleep on, sleep on, some fairy dream  
Perchance is woven in thy sleep—  
But, O, thy spirit, calm, serene  
Must wake to weep.

TAMERLANE

FANNY

The dying swan by northern lakes  
Sings its wild death song, sweet and clear;  
And as the solemn music breaks  
O'er hill and glen dissolves in air;  
Thus musical thy soft voice came,  
Thus trembled on thy tongue my name.

Like sunburst through the ebon cloud,  
Which veils the solemn midnight sky,  
Piercing cold evening's sable shroud,  
Thus came the first glance of that eye;  
But like the adamantine rock,  
My spirit met and braved the shock.

Let memory the boy recall  
Who laid his heart upon thy shrine,  
When far away his footsteps fall,  
Think that he deemed thy charms divine;  
A victim on love's alter [sic] slain,  
By witching eyes which looked disdain.

TAMERLANE

The pseudonym *Tamerlane* is, in view of Poe's use of the name on the title-page of his first and second volumes of verse, highly significant; and the tradition<sup>15</sup> that Poe contributed "for six months" to the *Visiter* further justifies an inquiry as to the possibility that these poems may be by his hand. It is apparent at once that both poems have much in common with the moody verses that grew out of Poe's loneliness and injured pride after he left Richmond in 1827. Read in conjunction with the 1827 versions of "I saw thee on thy bridal day," *A Dream Within a Dream*, *A Dream*, *The Happiest Day*, *the Happiest Hour* and *The Lake*; *To —* they are entirely in place. They are, moreover, strikingly similar to these poems in mechanical details. Poe's early work is characterized, for example, by a lack of variety in rime-words. In the 1827 *Tamerlane* the word *hour* is rimed ten times, five times with the same word, i. e., *power*. In the final revision only three such rimes are retained. In *The Happiest Day*, *the Happiest Hour* the same rime, *hour—power*, occurs three times. *To —* is in the same meter and stanza as this poem and uses the rimes *hour—show'r* and *flow'r—hour*. *Fanny* is similar in meter to *The Lake*; *To —*, to which it is akin in subject. It inevitably suggests, also, the song, "I saw thee on thy bridal day," and a boyish love such as Poe is said to have felt for Mrs. Stannard.<sup>16</sup> On the whole, the internal evidence so far confirms the suggestion of the pseudonym as to make it more than probable that in *Fanny* and *To —*, as well as in *Serenade*, we have authentic poems by Edgar Allan Poe.

JOHN C. FRENCH.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

<sup>15</sup> Harrison, I, 101.

<sup>16</sup> *Fanny* may possibly record such an affection for Mrs. Allan's sister, who was known to Poe as "Aunt Fanny." Cf. Woodberry, *The Life of Poe*, I, 29, 68.

## DESCHAMPS' BALLADE TO CHAUCER

In the paucity of biographic detail about Chaucer, the fact that he exchanged poems with the versatile and journalistic Eustace Deschamps has its importance; and it is not without interest to observe Gower's "Clerk of Venus" praised for his poetic technique by the author of the *Art de dictier et de fere chançons, balades, virelais, et rondeaulx*, the earliest of the long series of French *Arts poétiques*. The little poem permits of several other inferences: chief in value, perhaps, is the deduction that Chaucer's literary reputation in the mind of Deschamps was one of really great distinction.

M. Legouis speaks of this as "une ballade pompeuse"; Professor Kittredge characterizes it as "highly complimentary," but I do not gather that either of these eminent Chaucerians detects in it the note of insincerity. In spite of its high-tension style, a style forced and *tourmenté* to a degree unusual even for Deschamps, the ballade makes the impression upon me of having been sincerely meant: it is more than respectful in tone and was intended to bring results. It is a pity that Chaucer's original request—for the first move was evidently his—has not come down to us.

Unfortunately, the text<sup>1</sup> is in relatively poor condition: the unique manuscript was executed carelessly (Raynaud xi, 104) and no one has hitherto studied the language of this *Ballade* closely.

I have reprinted the text once more—*ni le premier, ni le dernier*—with a few retouches. These, and the translation which fol-

<sup>1</sup> Printed by T. Wright, in his *Anecdota Litteraria*, 1844, p. 13, from a rather careless copy furnished him by Paulin Paris; by P. Tarbé, in his *Collection des Poètes de Champagne: Poésies inédites d'Eustache Deschamps*, 1849, p. 123 (Deschamps having been born at Vertus, near Rheims); by Sandras, *Etude sur Chaucer*, 1859, p. 261; by the Marquis de Queux de St-Hilaire, for the Société des anciens Textes français, 1880 (II, 138, and add x, 218, 247; xi, 347, these annotations being the work of G. Raynaud); by P. Toynbee, in *Academy*, 1891 (XL, 342) and thence, more fully commented, in his *Specimens of Old French*, 1892, pp. 314, 482. Mr. Toynbee has the merit of having procured a new collation of the manuscript, the meager results of which he communicated to the *Academy*, *l. c.*

lows, find whatever justification I have been able to give them in the comments which follow.

## AUTRE BALADE

O Socratès plains de philosophie,  
 Seneque en meurs, Auglius en pratique,  
 Ovides grans en ta poëterie,  
 Briés en parler, saiges en rethorique,  
 5 Aigles treshaulz, qui par ta theorie  
 Enlumines le regne d'Eneas,  
 L'Isle aux Geans, ceuls de Bruth, et qu'i as  
 Semé les fleurs et planté le rosier  
 Aux ignorans de la langue Pandras,  
 10 Grant translateur, noble Geoffrey Chaucier;  
 Tu es d'Amours mondains Dieux en Albie:  
 Et *de la Rose*, en la terre Angelique  
 Qui, d'Angela saxonne, est puis flourie  
 Angleterre, d'elle ce nom s'applique  
 15 Le derrenier en l'ethimologique,  
 En bon anglès le *Livre translatas*;  
 Et un vergier, où du plant demandas  
 De ceuls qui font pour eux auctorisier,  
 A ja long temps que tu edifias,  
 20 Grand translateur, noble Geffroy Chaucier.  
 A toy pour ce de la fontaine Helye  
 Requier avoir un buvraige autentique,  
 Dont la doys est du tout en ta baillie,  
 Pour rafrener d'elle ma soif ethique,  
 25 Qui en Gaule seray paralitique  
 Jusques a ce que tu m'abuveras.  
 Eustaces sui, qui de mon plant aras:

2 ms. et anglux. W (right) Angles.

9 T (arbé) apprandras.

13 ms. et puis. W Angels Saxonne.

16 T Anglais.

19 R (aynaud) longtemps.

25 W Qu'en ma Gaule.

27 W Eustace; mon plans. qui de] read quite?

30      Mais pran en gré les euvres d'escolier  
           Que par Clifford de moy avoir pourras,  
           Grand translateur, noble Goeffroy Chaucier.

## L'ENVOY

Poëte hault, loënge d'escuïrie,  
     En ton jardin ne seroie qu'ortie:  
     Consideré ce que j'ay dit premier—  
     Ton noble plant, ta douce melodie;  
 35      Mais, pour sçavoir, de rescripre te prie,  
     Grant translateur, noble Geffroy Chaucier.

## TRANSLATION

O Socrates full of wisdom, a Seneca in uprightness of life, an Aulus Gellius in practical affairs, an Ovid great in thy poetic lore, brief in expression, wise in the art of the versifier:—lofty eagle (genius), who by thy science dost illuminate the kingdom of Aeneas, the Isle of Giants—they of Brutus—and who hast sown there the flowers (of verse) and planted the Rose-tree for (the benefit of) those ignorant of the Grecian tongue, O great translator, noble Geoffrey Chaucer;—

Thou art a mundane god of Love in Albia: and (thou translatedst the *Book*) of the *Rose* in the Angelic land, which from the Saxon lady Angela has since developed (into) Angle-land, (for it is) from her this name now is applied, being the last in the series of names:—thou translatedst the *Book* (*of the Rose*) into good English; and now for a long time thou hast been constructing a fruit-garden, for which thou didst ask some plants from those who poetize to win themselves solid reputation, O great translator, noble Geoffrey Chaucer;—

Wherefore I ask that I may have from thee a genuine draught from the spring of Hippocrene, whose rill is altogether in thy possession, so that I may check my feverish thirst for it: here in Gaul I shall be as a paralytic until thou shalt make me drink. A Eustace am I, thou shalt have some of my plants; but look with favor

31 ms. destruye. W destinye; T destmye; R (x: 247) "corrigez deservie."  
 32. R seroye.

upon the schoolboy productions which thou mayst receive from me through Clifford, O great translator, noble Geoffrey Chaucer.

High poet, (the) glory of squirehood, in thy garden I should be only a nettle: bethink thee of what I have described above, thy noble plants, thy sweet music! Nevertheless, that I may not be left in doubt, I beg thee to return me an official opinion, O great translator, noble Geoffrey Chaucer.

#### COMMENTS

Line 1. The kind of philosophy meant may be inferred from Deschamps, VIII, 149: Cato, reputed author of the *Disticha*, is also "plain de philosophie."

2. *en meurs*, that is, *en bonnes meurs*, as in the rondeau IV, 110. One of the variants to Dante's "Seneca morale" is "il buon Senaca" (*Inf.* IV, 141).

*Auglius* (ms. *anglux*) I take to be Aulus Gellius. Deschamps used the *Policraticus*, and the name appears there (Webb's excellent edition ii, p. 99, 28) as Agellius; and it was so generally spelled until corrected by Lambeck († 1680). "Quelquesuns," says the old *Dictionnaire de Trévoux*, "le nomment Agellius, d'autres Augellius." From St. Augustine's sanction: "Vir elegantissimi eloquii et multae ac facundae scientiae," down to Boccaccio's "noble historiar," Gellius, more popular than Quintilian, enjoyed a high reputation: a double reputation, in fact, for he was eminent both in letters and in the world of affairs as a judge. Even jurisconsults have drawn upon Gellius in matters of law: so Dirksen, *Hinterlassene Schriften*, I, 21. Chaucer, in Deschamps' mind, is eminent not only in letters, but also in "practice," as one may speak in these days of the practice of a lawyer, or of a physician.

Flanked as he is here by Seneca and Ovid, Gellius, it seems to me, has much better claims than the obscure and unpublished *Anglus* of Rome suggested by Raynaud (xi, 204).

In the ballade (III, 182) with the refrain, *Tuit y mourront, et li fol et li sage*, occurs: *Où est Auglas, le bon praticien?* I believe, with Raynaud, that this is the same person as the *Anglus* of the Chaucer ballade, the association of the name with *pratique-praticien* being significant. We might then read here (line 2) *Auglus*, and retain *et*.

3. *poëterie*, "c'est-à-dire mythologie classique. Voy. dans Langlois, *Recueil des arts de seconde rhétorique*, pp. 39, 65, 97, trois listes de noms mythologiques utiles à connaître en *poeterie*." So Raynaud, xi, 220.

4. *Briés en parler*. The precept goes back, I believe, to the tract "Tullius in quarto rethoricorum libro ad Herennium," ed. Marx, p. 195-6, once attributed to Cicero; it is expounded as early as Brunetto Latini, *Trésor*, p. 519. Deschamps cites it again (vii, 208): *Parler briefment, en substance et en bien*, etc.

*réthorique*. Machaut, hailed by Deschamps as *le noble rēthorique* in the two ballades on his death (i, 243-46), understands the function of rhetoric in this wise: "Rētorique verſefier Fait l'amant et metrifier, Et si fait faire jolis vers Nouviaus et de metres divers," etc. (*Œuvres*, ed. Hoepffner, i, 10).

5. *théorique*. "Ce est cele propre science qui nos enseigne la premiere question, de savoir et de conoistre les natures de toutes choses celestiaus et terriennes." B. Latini, *Trésor*, p. 5.

6. *Enlumines*. Professor Lowes finds some remarkable similarities of expression between this first strophe and Chaucer's salutation to Petrarch (*PMLA*, xix, 641).

8. *les fleurs*, i. e., the fixed forms like those described in the *Art de dictier*. The "Champ royal," for instance, is one of the "bright flowers" of fourteenth century poetry in a *chant royal* reprinted by Miss Cohen, *The Ballade*, p. 356-7.

*planté le rosier*. The word *rosier* is frequent in both parts of the *Roman de la Rose* (ed. Michel i, 53, ii, 348-49), being especially prominent at the very end. Christine de Pizan attributes to Gerson the pious wish: "Pleust a Dieu que telle rose n'eust onques esté plantée ou jardin de Chretienté!" (Ward's Chicago Dissertation, *The Epistles on the Romance of the Rose*, 1911, p. 107-8).

9. *La langue Pandras*. The allusion to the Brutus story (*Eneas*—*les Geans*—*Bruth*—*Pandras*) of Geoffrey of Monmouth and his continuators is evident (Raynaud x, 218); Toynbee (*Specimens*, p. 482) is the first to attempt an explanation of this phrase: "The language of Brutus being *English*, the language of Pandrasus, the foe of Brutus, must obviously be *French*, the language of the hereditary foes of England." This seems substantially correct, for the *Livre de la Rose* is indeed in French; but Toynbee, in omitting some of the intermediate steps in the comparison, seems to have missed much of its point.

The "language of Pandras" was, and must remain, the Greek language (I agree here with Hoepffner, *E. Deschamps*, 1904, p. 173); that of Brutus was never English, but Trojan, or, according to Geoffrey of Monmouth (1, 16), a sort of "rough Greek." The idea in Deschamps' mind then, seems to have taken shape thus: Trojan, a rough Greek, was to good Greek, as Chaucer's *langage*, in the *Rose* translation, was to the French of Guillaume de Lorris and Jean de Meung.

"Personne au xiii<sup>e</sup> siècle n'a manié la langue française comme Jean de Meun," says E. Langlois, to whom we are looking for the first critical edition of the whole poem. And as to the First Part, the work of Guillaume de Lorris, its descriptions "ont été souvent citées parmi les plus belles pages de notre vieille poésie." Contemporaries of Deschamps—Jean de Montreuil, Gontier Col, Pierre Col—speak of the style of the *Livre de la Rose* in terms of boundless admiration; Gerson, who would have had it burned ("Ad ignem, chari homines, ad ignem!"), makes one of its defenders say: *in loquela gallica non habet similem* (Ward, pp. 41, 48, and *passim*). In the full tide of the French Renaissance, Du Bellay has, remarkably enough, the same opinion, he who would otherwise make a *tabula rasa* of the literary baggage of older France: "De tous les anciens poëtes françois, quasi un seul (*sic*), Guillaume de Lauris et Jean de Meun sont dignes d'estre leus, non tant pour ce qu'il y ait en eux beaucoup de choses qui se doivent imiter des modernes, comme pour y voir quasi comme une premiere image de la langue françoise. . . ." (*Defense et Illustration*, II, ii). Under the weight of this immense reputation of the Rose Romance as a *testo di lingua*, Chaucer's responsibility as translator must have been, to any French poet of the day, a very serious one. I presume, however, that Deschamps meant to say no more than that the perfect French of de Lorris and de Meun had necessarily suffered in translation, which is likely enough, on general grounds. Or, did he mean to imply that the language of France was in his time at a higher level of cultivation than the language of the "Angelic land"?

A not altogether futile monograph might be written upon the theme of the French language as being equal, or next, in perfection to the Greek. Ser Brunetto's *Trésor* mentions Greek as among the three sacred tongues, and among the vernaculars he prefers French

as being "plus delitable et plus commune a toutes gens." The idea of associating the two must have occurred to many Frenchmen, long before Henri Estienne, moved by his dislike of the temporary prestige of Italian and Spanish, composed his treatise in due form on the *Conformité du Langage françois avec le Grec* (c. 1565). Outside of France, one might also cite Mellema (*Dict. flamand-français*, 1591), who eulogizes "la tresnoble et tresparfaite langue Françoise, laquelle regne et s'use pour la plus commode, la plus facile, voir la plus accomplie de toutes autres en la chrestienté, laquelle a grande affinité avec la Grecque. . . ." But I have not met with the idea elsewhere in Deschamps.

11. *Tu es.* The classic epistolary *Tu* was unfamiliar enough to Deschamps and his contemporaries to call for apology and explanation at times. Thus Gontier Col to Christine de Pizan (Ward, p. 31): "Et se ores . . . t'appelle en singulier, ne te desplaise, ne me le imputes a arrogance ou orgueil, car c'est et a esté tousiours ma maniere quant j'ay escript a mes amis, especialment quant sont lettrés." Similarly Pierre Col (p. 57) uses *tu* "pour parler plus proprement selonc que nos anciens maistres ont parley." Christine herself, in her *Epistre à Deschamps*, explains that she adopts *Tu* from "le stille clergial, de quoy ceulx usent Qui en science leur temps usent." (*Œuvres poétiques*, II, 296.) Thus Deschamps is also, consciously, a bit "high-brow."

*mondains* should not be associated with *Amours* (Toynbee) but with *Dieux*. One of Deschamps' ballades to Machaut (I, 245) salutes him thus: "O Guillaume, mondains Dieux d'harmonie." Cf. II, 207, *uns mondains paradis*.

13. *Angela saxonne.* Just what medieval etymologizer first wilfully took (or mistook) *Angla* in *Englaland* for a Latin fem. in *-a*, and deduced therefrom a mythical eponym *Angela*—described elsewhere by Deschamps (VI, 87) as "fille a un duc puissant de Saxoine"—is not at present known, nor is it, perhaps, a matter of importance. Toynbee (*Specimens*, p. 483) asserts that *Angela saxonne* is not mentioned in Wace's *Brut*, but a more attentive reading of the passage (I, vv. 1227-36) certainly shows that the basis of the myth is there. Wace states, independently of Geoffrey of Monmouth, that 1) Guermont betrayed the country to the Saxons; 2) the Saxons named the English after "Angle" (the usual OFr. spelling for the originally proparoxytone *angele*; cf. G. Paris,

*Etude sur le Rôle de l'Accent latin*, p. 24-26, and, for other examples, the ms. of the *Voyage de Charlemagne* which has 377 *angle* but 672 *angele*); and 3) they named the country Angleterre. As Wace did not say whose daughter "Angela" was, it was but natural to surmise—and then to state—that she was the daughter of "a powerful Saxon duke."

Spenser, *F. Q.* III, iii, 55, 56, 58, as Professor A. S. Cook points out to me, reproduces the story, as had done, before Deschamps, Higden, *Polychronicon* II, p. 4, and others; but where did Wace get it?

18. *ceuls qui font*, 'they who write verse.' Toynbee cites, aptly, Chaucer's "flour of hem that make in Fraunce."

Toynbee needlessly finds a difficulty in *pour eux auctorisier*: the pronoun is reflexive, as regularly in OFr., a variant of *por soi auctorisier*. *¶ livre est molt auctorizez* says Frère Angier, who is preparing to versify the famous *Dialogues of Pope Gregory* (Cloran, p. 14).

21. *la fontaine Helye*. Raynaud (x, 144), followed by Toynbee, translates *Helye* by 'Helicon,' but this identification is very far from self-explanatory. The tradition, certainly, would be rather to identify Hélye (Hélie, Elie) either with Lat. Aelius, whence possibly in French proper names, or preferably with Elias, the prophet Elijah, as does Deschamps himself (II, 2 and VI, 104) where the ms. in both cases has *Helie*. One might also cite one of the contemporary collections of *poeterie* (Langlois, *Arts*, p. 67) which, after mentioning Enoc, tells us on the basis of Mal. IV, 5: "Helie est le message et denunciateur du derrain advenement qui vaut autant à dire que le jour du jugement." See also McKnight, *PMLA*, xix, 326. Might the brook Cherith, whence the inspired Elijah drank, be the runlet (*la doys*) for which Deschamps is so thirsty?

The *Policraticus*, one of the favorite sources of Deschamps, relates that the Emperor Hadrian, after the rebuilding of Jerusalem, proposed to change the name of the city to Helia (that is, Aelia), and Deschamps knows of Hadrian (IX, 364) as Hellius Adrians. Might then some spring in Jerusalem—say the pool of Bethsaida (John v, 2) where the paralytics waited—be the Fountain of Helia needed, and Deschamps be one of the *aridorum*, cf. *paralitique* in line 25?

It was at this stage of peregrination in search of a probably

imaginary fountain that I encountered a statement which, I believe, vindicates fully Messrs. Raynaud and Toynbee, but by no means excuses them for having led us so long a chase. It appears that there has been (since when?) a Christian chapel dedicated to Hagios Elias on Mt. Helicon, not more than a hundred yards from the classic spring of Hippocrene (Pauly-Wissowa, *xvi*, 1854; Baedeker's *Greece* <sup>4</sup>, p. 164). It may be true that no streamlet does actually issue from Hippocrene, but nothing seems to exclude the possibility that Deschamps had heard or read of the Fountain of Elias on Mt. Helicon, the ancient haunt of the Muses. But—had Chaucer ever heard of it?

In a second passage, this time in the eulogy of Machaut (1, 245). Deschamps again refers to the *fonteine Helie*, and here it is coupled with a still more elusive spring, *la fons Circé*: of these two fountains Machaut, like Chaucer, was *le ruisseau et les doi*. Dernedde (p. 132) gives Circé up without a struggle, and I, fortunately, am not bound to attack her. There was a *fontaine Dircé*, near Thebes, which came down to medieval attention in the *Roman de Thèbes* (5250); but I cannot discover that it was one of the sources of poetic inspiration. It might be noted that Circe and Calypso—both sorceresses and seers—were rather badly mixed in the medieval mind at times (the *Roman de Troie* associates “Circès” and “Calipsa” in a long passage, 28701 ff.) and it may be that the four mysterious fountains of Calypso’s cave were the *causae et fontes maeroris* in this case.

27. *Eustaces sui*. The legend of Placidus-Eustachius was a great favorite in France, a favor increased by the transfer of the saint’s remains from Rome to the Abbey of St. Denis. In the opening sentences of his life in the *Legenda aurea*, Eustachius is described as *operibus misericordiae valde assiduus*; and a prose life (P. Meyer, *Hist. litt. de la France*, XXXIII, 383) elaborates the matter of his extraordinary generosity as follows: Il secoroit toz cels qui avoient mestier de secors; il aidoit toz cels qui avoient mestier d'aide; . . . il relevoit de son avoir les povres; il revestoit les nuz; il repessoit les famelleus; il departoit de ses viez choses. . . One of the metrical versions analyzed by Monteverdi (*Studi medievali*, III, 392 ff.) is even more satisfactorily specific:

A veves dames donoit e pain e sel.

"Named as I am after the great St. Eustace, pattern of those who give liberally to those who ask of them," says Deschamps, "your request shall be granted; but please look indulgently upon these school-boy efforts."

*qui de mon plant aras.* "I am Eustace (that write to thee) who shalt have herbs from my garden," translates Toynbee; but to change thus the antecedent of *qui* seems rather a bold piece of surgery. If we should take *qui* as OFr. *cui*, and *aras* as equivalent to *prendras* or *obtiendras* (*avoir* in the sense of 'get' is well known) we might venture: "from whom thou shalt get some of my plants"; but the expression remains very awkward. I am inclined to think the reading wrong, and to correct:

Eustace sui, quite mon plant aras,  
Mais pran en gré. . . .

That is, "Thou shalt have it freely, but . . ." For the expression *avoir qqch quite*, cf. Crestien's *Erec* 599, and *Roman de Troie* 4690, 4693.

29. *Clifford*. For Lewis Clifford—l'amoureux Cliffort—see now Kittredge, *Mod. Phil.* I, 6-13.

31. *loënge d'escuîrie*. Hulbert's Chicago Dissertation has proved, says a reviewer (*M. L. Notes*, XXVII, 192), "that Chaucer's was a typical esquire's career." Deschamps also was a *scutifer*: the poet refers to himself as a *vieil escuier d'escuirie* (VIII, 179) and again (VII, 123) as "*Eustace . . . qui de votre escurie est de long temps*," i. e., since 1375, at least (Raynaud, XI, 13, n. 9). It appears then, that one esquire is praising another as the ornament of their common rank.

The ms. has *loenge destruye*, which has long been a puzzle. But the ms. frequently has (*t*) for (*c*); cf. *treüteus* for *creüreus* (III, 136 and X, 132), *desterre* for *descerre* (II, 194), and, conversely, *couchent* for *touchent* (V, 4 and X, 250). Again, *escruie* appears to be by metathesis for the normal *escûrie*: one may note *atrempance* VII, 213, *frommiere* for *formiere* 'ant-hill' I, 287, just as elsewhere in dialect I have noted *fortreëce* for *forterece*. *Escûrie* is quite normal for Deschamps' time (cf. Tobler, *Versbau*, pp. 44, 50) as reduced from *escuërie*, Ital. *scudaria*. Lastly, *escuierie*, later *escuirie*, is a current form which is combined from *escuier* and *escuërie*, both of which conform exactly to phonetic law. The word

means "l'ensemble des écuyers, pages, etc., qui forment la maison d'un roi ou d'un seigneur."

For an instance of *loange* in the sense of 'glory,' 'renown,' see Crestien's *Ivain*, 2189. Malherbe (1, 150) speaks of "Mars, qui met sa louange à déserter (= dépeupler) la terre."

34. *melodie*. In his *Art de dictier* (vii, 269) Deschamps explains "nous avons deux musiques, dont l'une est artificielle et l'autre est naturelle." By the first he means music, and by the second poetry; Chaucer's *douce melodie*, therefore, is, in this technical sense, his sweet verse.

35. *rescripre*. Hoepffner, I believe, is right (p. 175) in seeing more in this verb than merely "to make a written reply"; Deschamps, whose vanity is uneasy, asks from Chaucer a *rescript*, an official written decision of emperor or pope, as to the real merits of the *œuvres d'escolier* sent him by the medium of Clifford. Cf. *PMLA*, xix, 641, n., and Wells, *Manual*, p. 669, for conjectures as to the actual poem sent.

T. ATKINSON JENKINS.

*University of Chicago.*

#### "THE DEVIL AND DOCTOR FOSTER"

A number of years ago Professor Thomas Stockham Baker called attention<sup>1</sup> to the expression "the devil and Doctor Foster" as used in Maryland and West Virginia. He suggested its connection with the Faust legend, and inquired for further information in regard to it. As his note appears to have elicited no response, it may be of interest to present the following facts.

The expression is at least as old as the year 1726, for Defoe, in his *Political History of the Devil*, published in that year in London, speaks<sup>2</sup> of "the famous Dr. *Faustus* or *Foster*, of whom we have believed such strange Things, as that it is become a Proverb, *as great as the Devil and Dr. Foster*." The author also remarks:<sup>3</sup> "No doubt the *Devil* and Dr. *Faustus* were very intimate: I should

<sup>1</sup> *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xi, 63.

<sup>2</sup> P. 377 (p. 347 of the Oxford reprint of 1840).

<sup>3</sup> P. 286 (p. 261, ed. Oxford).

rob you of a very significant \* [ \* *As great as the Devil and Doctor Faustus. Vulg. Dr. Foster.*] Proverb if I should as much as doubt it."

The original form of the expression, "the Devil and Dr. Faustus," occurs as the title of a play referred to in a four-page pamphlet called "A Walk to Smithfield, or a true description of the humours of Bartholomew Fair" (London, 1701).<sup>4</sup> As an exclamation the phrase recurs in Fielding's *Tom Jones* (1749).<sup>5</sup>

Professor Henry Wood reminds me that the linking of Faust and his mentor in one phrase is as old as Shakespeare's day, for Bardolph<sup>6</sup> speaks of the "cozeners" who "set spurs and away, like three German devils, three Doctor Faustuses." Professor Alfred E. Richards, of New Hampshire State College, has pointed out<sup>7</sup> a passage in Shadwell's comedy *The Sullen Lovers* (1688), in which Sir Positive-At-All announces that he can "raise a devil with Doctor Faustus himself, if he were alive," and another in *Punch's Petition to the Ladies*, in which it is said of one Vander Hop "nor was he civil to Doctor Faustus nor the devil."

"The Devil and Doctor Faustus" appears in America as the title of a curious little chap-book of twelve pages, duodecimo, which Professor G. L. Kittredge, of Harvard University, very courteously lent me from his private library. This chap-book, which is divided into fourteen chapters, is entitled: "The Devil and Doctor Faustus. Containing the history of the wicked life and horrid death of Doctor John Faustus, and shewing how he sold himself to the Devil, to have power for twenty-four years to do what he pleased. Also the strange things done by him and Mephistopheles. With an Account

<sup>4</sup> For this reference, as well as for those to the original edition of Defoe, I am indebted to Tille's very learned work, *Die Faustsplitter in der Literatur des sechzehnten bis achtzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Berlin, 1900-04), pp. 515, 1130, and 1144. Tille indicates that he did not have access to "A Walk to Smithfield," but fails to give the source of his reference to it. His information comes from Morley's *Memoirs of Bartholomew Fair* (London 1859), p. 353, to which Professor J. W. Bright kindly referred me.

<sup>5</sup> Vol. iv (ed. London, 1902), p. 236 (Book XVIII, chap. viii): "What the devil and Doctor Faustus! shan't I do what I will with my own daughter, especially when I desire nothing but her own good?"

<sup>6</sup> *Merry Wives of Windsor* (Cambridge ed.), IV, v, l. 64. Cf. Tille, *op. cit.*, p. 147.

<sup>7</sup> *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxii, p. 41.

how the Devil came to him at the end of twenty-four years and tore him to pieces. Montpelier: Printed by Carlos C. Darling, 1807." This pamphlet, according to Professor F. H. Wilkens,<sup>8</sup> is "presumably a reprint or adaptation of one of the English chap-books on the subject." Professor Richards kindly informs me that not one of a score of other Faust texts of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries which he has studied bears the title "The Devil and Doctor Faustus." He is inclined to suspect that the Montpelier chap-book is a condensation of the text printed at Worcester, Mass., in 1795.

The popularity of the Faust story in America antedates by more than a century the publication of these chap-books. I am again indebted to Professor Kittredge for the information that between 1682 and 1685 John Usher, a Boston bookseller, imported from London no less than sixty-six copies of a "History of Dr. Faustus."<sup>9</sup> This book Mr. Ford identifies with "The History of the Damnable Life and deserved Death of Doctor John Faustus; now newly printed, issued in 1677 for T. Sawbridge." Professor Richards has seen an edition dated 1682 (cf. *PMLA*, xxi, 810). It would seem more likely that the book imported into Boston in 1682-85 bore the date of 1682 rather than that of 1677.

One is inclined to wonder whether another American expression is akin to that discussed by Professor Baker. In Barrère and Leland's *Dictionary of Slang, Jargon and Cant* (London, 1897) appears the following article: "Devil and Tom Walker, the (American), an old saying once common in New England to the effect that it 'beats the Devil and Tom Walker,' or 'he fared as Tom Walker did with the Devil.' In the *Marvellous Repository*, a curious collection of tales, many of them old Boston legends, there is one of *Tom Walker*, who sold himself to the *Devil*. The book was published about 1832." No information seems to be accessible as to the *Marvellous Repository*. Irving's *Tales of a Traveller* (1824) contains an amusing sketch entitled "The Devil and Tom Walker."<sup>10</sup> Professor Carl von Doren, who has made a study of

<sup>8</sup> *Americana Germanica*, III, 186. I owe this reference to Professor Richards.

<sup>9</sup> Cf. Worthington C. Ford, *The Boston Book-Market, 1679-1700*. (Boston, Club of Odd Volumes, 1917), pp. 104, 119, 129, 148.

<sup>10</sup> This sketch was reprinted anonymously in a little chap-book: (7 x 11

Irving's tales, informs me that he has "never come across any earlier version of the Devil and Tom Walker story than that in the 1824 *Tales of a Traveller*.<sup>11</sup> The phrase 'to beat the devil and Tom Walker' was familiar to me in childhood (in Illinois), and my wife knew it, she says, in Florida. Each of us lived in a community pretty well stocked with New Englanders, but of course I cannot be sure that Tom Walker was folklore." Dean A. L. Bouton, of New York University, tells me that he has heard "the devil and Tom Walker" in Central New York. It would be interesting to know more about Tom Walker and his associate than Irving's conscientious history and the preceding statements indicate. It is curious in this connection to note that Professor Richards has found<sup>12</sup> "traces of the Faust story" in the tale of the "Spectre Bridegroom," in Irving's *Sketch-Book*.<sup>13</sup>

D. S. BLONDHEIM.

*The Johns Hopkins University.*

---

cm.) published at Woodstock, Vt., in 1830. A story by an unknown author, entitled "Deacon Grubb and the Old Nick," follows it in the same pamphlet. A copy of this publication is found in the Library of Congress, as Miss Jennie A. Craig, of the staff of the University of Illinois library, pointed out to me.

"He has called my attention to an interesting change in the speech of the "iron-faced Cape Cod whaler" with which the tale is introduced. "In the first edition, Part 4, p. 21, the whaler says: 'Ah, well, there is an odd story I have heard about one Tom Walker, who they say dug up some of Kidd's buried money.' But in the later version (e. g., ed. Philadelphia, 1840), the whaler says the story 'was written by a neighbor of mine and . . . I learnt [it] by heart.'"

<sup>11</sup> *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxiii, 119.

<sup>12</sup> A chat at the recent Modern Language Association meeting led to the suggestion that "Dr. Foster" of Defoe and Professor Baker may be a relative of the hero of the nursery rhyme:

Dr. Foster went to Gloucester  
In a shower of rain.  
He slipped in a puddle up to his middle,  
And never went there again.

I leave the further study of this fascinating problem to future investigators.

## NACHTRAG ZUR WIELAND-BIBLIOGRAPHIE

### 1. *Geschichte des Agathon, 1766, 1767*

In meiner als Abhandlung der Berliner Akademie erschienenen Schrift über die Wieland-Doppeldrucke<sup>1</sup> habe ich wiederholt die Vermutung ausgesprochen, dass sich mit der Zeit noch andere Drucke finden würden. Diese Vermutung hat sich vollkommen bestätigt, und sollen also im Folgenden die inzwischen gemachten Funde beschrieben werden.

Von der ersten Ausgabe des *Agathon* liegen mir jetzt zwei Drucke vor, die sich mit den von Seuffert<sup>2</sup> unter No. 142 erwähnten zu decken scheinen. Die von Seuffert aufgeworfene Frage, ob der jüngere Druck mit Wielands Wissen erschienen sei, ist ziemlich sicher zu verneinen. Auch sind die typographischen und orthographischen Unterschiede, die Interpunktionsänderungen und die Verbesserung der Druckfehler lediglich dem Drucker zuzuschreiben. Im allgemeinen sind die Abweichungen nicht erheblich. Der ältere Druck setzt konsequent *kan*, *Anblick*, *sezen*, *vortrefflich*, usw., wogegen der jüngere, besonders im zweiten Teile, *kann*, *Anblick*, *setzen*, *vortrefflich* schreibt. Die Interpunktionsänderungen werden viele Kommata eingefügt: auf S. 41-47 des zweiten Teiles, z. B., lassen sich nicht weniger als 24 Abweichungen dieser Art verzeichnen. Während dabei der jüngere Druck selbstverständlich die im älteren verzeichneten Druckfehler verbessert, werden auch neue, und zwar teilweise sehr grobe, eingeführt. Auf die Ausgabe von 1773 (E<sup>2</sup>) hat er jüngere Druck nicht nachgewirkt, obschon sich gelegentlich ein zufälliges Zusammestimmen nachweisen lässt.

Schon äusserlich lassen sich die beiden Drucke leicht unter-

<sup>1</sup> *Die Doppeldrucke in ihrer Bedeutung für die Textgeschichte von Wielands Werken.* Abhandlungen der Königlich Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Jahrgang 1913, Phil.-Hist. Classe, No. 7. Berlin, 1913.

<sup>2</sup> *Prolegomena zu einer Wieland-Ausgabe. Im Auftrage der Deutschen Kommission entworfen von Prof. Dr. Bernhard Seuffert in Graz.* Aus dem Anhang zu den Abhandlungen der Königl. Preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften vom Jahre 1904, 1905, 1908, 1909 (Sechs Hefte). Berlin, 1904-1909.

scheiden, indem der zweite Teil des älteren (E<sup>1a</sup>) 351 Seiten Text, 2 Seiten Druckfehler und 14 Seiten Bücheranzeigen (des Jahres 1767) von Orell, Gessner und Compagnie enthält, während der jüngere Druck (E<sup>1b</sup>) lediglich 353 Seiten Text aufweist, ohne Druckfehlerverzeichnis und ohne Bücheranzeigen. Dagegen findet sich im ersten Teile des jüngeren Drucks, zwischen Titel und Vorbericht, ein churfürstlich-sächsisches Privilegium, worin Verleger und Verfasser genannt werden: *Orell, Gessner, Füsslin und Comp. zu Zürich, . . . Geschichte des Agathon, von Wieland, 2 Theile.* Ferner trägt der jüngere Druck auf beiden Titeln den Vermerk: *Mit allernädigster Freyheit.* Durch dieses am 21. März 1770 zu Dresden ausgestellte Privilegium lässt sich das Erscheinungsjahr des Doppeldrucks feststellen,—auf dem Titel steht natürlich das Datum 1766. Möglicherweise existieren noch weitere Drucke, die jedoch durch Vergleichung folgender Lesarten leicht zu erkennen sein werden:

I. Teil, Titel: Virtus, et quid E<sup>1a</sup>, Virtus, & quid E<sup>1b</sup>. S. 8, 8 Jüngling E<sup>1a</sup>, Jünglings E<sup>1b</sup> E<sup>2</sup>. 10, 10 näherte, sich E<sup>1a</sup>, näherten sich E<sup>1b</sup> E<sup>2</sup>. 15, 8 die Seelen E<sup>1a</sup>, die Seele E<sup>1b</sup>. 16, 18 nach Corinth E<sup>1a</sup>, noch Corinth E<sup>1b</sup>. 28, 11 und Gedankenlos E<sup>1a</sup> E<sup>2</sup>, und gedankenlos E<sup>1b</sup>. 30, 24 Bachantinnen E<sup>1a</sup>, Bacchantinnen E<sup>1b</sup> E<sup>2</sup>. 32, 28 Abwechselungen E<sup>1a</sup>, Abwechslungen E<sup>1b</sup> E<sup>2</sup>. 37, 1 könnten E<sup>1a</sup> E<sup>2</sup>, könnte E<sup>1b</sup>. 41, 18 Müssigangs E<sup>1a</sup>, Müsiggangs E<sup>1b</sup>. 47, 26 Alcinous E<sup>1a</sup>, Alcionus E<sup>1b</sup>. 50, 16 erleichtern; und gaben E<sup>1a</sup> E<sup>2</sup>, erleichtern; Sie gaben E<sup>1b</sup>. 53, 17 geschäftige und fröhliche E<sup>1a</sup>, geschäftigte und fröhliche E<sup>1b</sup>.

II. Teil, S. 11, 9 schimmernde E<sup>1a</sup>, schimmernde E<sup>1b</sup>. 13, 11 Ansdruk E<sup>1a</sup>, Ausdruck E<sup>1b</sup>. 13, 13 würsamsten E<sup>1a</sup>, wirksamsten E<sup>1b</sup>. 16, 25 Bottschaften E<sup>1a</sup>, Botschaften E<sup>1b</sup>. 18, 3, 4 beschäftige E<sup>1a</sup> E<sup>2</sup>, beschäftigte E<sup>1b</sup>. 19, 9 Geschlecht E<sup>1a</sup>, Geschlechte E<sup>1b</sup> E<sup>2</sup>. 21, 9, 10 erforderte E<sup>1a</sup> E<sup>2</sup>, erforderte E<sup>1b</sup>. 22, 20 Grausamer, rief er aus, rede E<sup>1a</sup> E<sup>2</sup>, Grausamer! (rief er aus) Rede E<sup>1b</sup>. 23, 9 gefunden hat? E<sup>1a</sup> E<sup>2</sup>, gefunden? E<sup>1b</sup>. 23, 17 ungläubigen E<sup>1a</sup> E<sup>2</sup>, ungläubigen E<sup>1b</sup>. 30, 14 Forderungen E<sup>1a</sup> E<sup>2</sup>, Forderungen E<sup>1b</sup>. 32, 2 Genung E<sup>1a</sup>, Genug E<sup>1b</sup>. 35, 1 Irthums E<sup>1a</sup>, Irrtums E<sup>1b</sup>. 40, 18 von ihrem Vorgängern E<sup>1a</sup>, von ihren Vorgängern E<sup>1b</sup>. 43, 7 vollkommer E<sup>1a</sup>, vollkommen E<sup>1b</sup>. 46, 27 kommt E<sup>1a</sup>, kömmt E<sup>1b</sup>. 57, 9 Farth E<sup>1a</sup>, Fahrt E<sup>1b</sup>. 57, 11 genung E<sup>1a</sup>, genug E<sup>1b</sup> E<sup>2</sup>. 59, 22 Grazien E<sup>1a</sup>, Gratzien E<sup>1b</sup>. 60, 26 seines eignen Herzens E<sup>1a</sup> E<sup>2</sup>, seines Herzens E<sup>1b</sup>. 61, 15 denenjenigen E<sup>1a</sup> E<sup>2</sup>, denjenigen E<sup>1b</sup>. 62, 22 f. ernstaften, und schwärzlichten, zu einer andern alles in einem E<sup>1a</sup>: *die Zeile fehlt* E<sup>1b</sup>. 63, 2 beneidenswürdigen E<sup>1a</sup> E<sup>2</sup>, beneidungswürdigen E<sup>1b</sup>.

63, 11 durch Rosengebüsche E<sup>1a</sup> E<sup>2</sup>, durch die Rosengebüsche E<sup>1b</sup>.  
 63, 19 behaubten E<sup>1a</sup>, behaupten E<sup>1b</sup>. 343, 14 Plaze E<sup>1a</sup>, Platz  
 E<sup>1b</sup>. 351, 25 (353, 3) Nachtigallen E<sup>1a</sup>, Nachtigalen E<sup>1b</sup>.

2. *Comische Erzählungen, Zweyte und verbesserte Auflage*

Die erste Auflage (E<sup>1</sup>) der *Comischen Erzählungen* erschien im Jahre 1765, und zwar, wie alle folgenden Ausgaben, ohne Ort und Verleger. Dass die "Zweyte und verbesserte Auflage" (E<sup>2</sup>) mit dem Datum MDCCCLXVIII in zwei verschiedenen, wenngleich äusserlich übereinstimmenden Drucken vorliegt, ist bisher nicht bemerkt worden, und es soll daher der Zweck dieses Aufsatzes sein, die Nachwirkung dieser beiden Drucke festzustellen. Ein dritter Druck (E<sup>3</sup>) der zweyten und verbesserten Auflage trägt—wohl aus Versehen—das Datum MDCCCLXVIII, und zählt nur 182 Seiten, während E<sup>2ab</sup> übereinstimmend 194 Seiten aufweisen. Bei dem folgenden Drucke (E<sup>4</sup>), mit dem Datum MDCCCLXXV fehlt die Bezeichnung der Auflage. Dieser Druck hat 184 Seiten. Weitere Auflagen sind mir nicht bekannt. Später wurden die *Comischen Erzählungen*, mit Ausnahme von *Juno und Ganymed*, den *Griechischen Erzählungen* einverlebt, unter welchem Titel sie im Jahre 1785 im zweiten Bande der *Auserlesenen Gedichte* (B<sup>5</sup>) erschienen. Im zehnten Bande der Ausgabe letzter Hand (C<sup>1</sup>) wurde dann die Rubrik *Komische Erzählungen* wieder eingeführt.

Als Originaldruck der zweiten Auflage kennzeichnet sich derjenige Druck, dessen Lesarten und Schreibweisen am genauesten mit der ersten Auflage übereinstimmen. Im allgemeinen schreiben E<sup>1</sup> E<sup>2a</sup> übereinstimmend: *kan, Blik, Glück, Baken, Schmuk, bedekt, loken, öffnet, setzt, Kaze, Nahmen, verliehrt, schwehr*, E<sup>2b</sup> dagegen: *kann, Blick, Glück, Backen, Schmuck, bedeckt, locken, öffnet, setzt, Katze, Namen, verliert, schwer*. Von etwa noch unbekannten, ähnlichen Doppeldrucken wird E<sup>2b</sup> durch folgende auffällige Druckfehler zu unterscheiden sein: 9, 9 rvth; 15, 4 nnnmehr stehts hey dir; 20, 18 weg, so so steht; 22, 12 von da viel Glanz; 24, 1 eurer Herz; 26, 16 den Hirt; 30, 20 in der der That; 35, 8 braucht sie nur; 147, 6 Auf welchem Moos; 171, 9 vvn Berg. Als augenfällige Druckfehler finden sich in E<sup>2a</sup> ein paar falsche Kustoden: S. 81, *Und* anstatt *Zum*; S. 92, 140. *Wenn* anstatt 140. *Von*. In beiden Drucken sind die Verszahlen auf S. 129-134 um 100 zu hoch:

850 anstatt 750, usw., bis 945. Anstatt der in dieser Reihe zu erwartenden Zahl 865 haben jedoch beide 665.

Beide Drucke haben nachgewirkt: von E<sup>2a</sup> stammt die Ausgabe des Jahres 1769 ab, von E<sup>2b</sup> diejenige des Jahres 1775. Man beachte z. b. folgende Lesarten: S. 11, 9 hab' ihm E<sup>1</sup> E<sup>2a</sup> E<sup>3</sup>, hab ihm E<sup>2b</sup> E<sup>4</sup> B<sup>5</sup>. 11, 12 machen; E<sup>1</sup> E<sup>2a</sup> E<sup>3</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, machen, E<sup>2b</sup> E<sup>4</sup>. 25, 18 Was ihnen fehlt E<sup>1</sup> E<sup>2a</sup> E<sup>3</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, Was ihm fehlt E<sup>2b</sup> E<sup>4</sup>. 26, 2 Nachsichtvoller Blik E<sup>1</sup> E<sup>2a</sup>, nachsitzvoller Blick E<sup>2b</sup>, nachsichtvoller Blik E<sup>3</sup>, nachsitzvoller Blick E<sup>4</sup>, nachsitzvoller blik B<sup>5</sup>. 30, 12 wolltet E<sup>2a</sup> E<sup>3</sup>, wollet E<sup>2b</sup> E<sup>4</sup>. 36, 19 Näschen E<sup>1</sup> E<sup>2a</sup> E<sup>3</sup>, Näsgen E<sup>2b</sup> E<sup>4</sup>.

Der Stammbaum von B<sup>5</sup>, der Vorlage der Ausgabe letzter Hand, lässt sich nicht sicher bestimmen, da die Lesarten bald mit E<sup>2a</sup>, bald mit E<sup>2b</sup> gehen: man möchte fast annehmen, dass irgend ein unbekanntes Mittelglied existiert. Übrigens beschränken sich die meisten der in Betracht kommenden Lesarten auf Orthographie, Interpunktions- oder offensichtliche Druckfehler, die in den folgenden Ausgaben unabhängig von einander geregelt oder beseitigt wurden:

31, 6 schlauen Buhlerey E<sup>1</sup> E<sup>2a</sup> E<sup>3</sup>, vollen Buhlerey E<sup>2b</sup> E<sup>4</sup>, feinen buhlerey B<sup>5</sup>, feinen Buhlerey C<sup>1</sup>. 160, 11 widersinnisch E<sup>1</sup> E<sup>2a</sup> E<sup>3</sup>, widersinnig E<sup>2b</sup> E<sup>4</sup> B<sup>5</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 165, 10 rosenfarbes E<sup>1</sup> E<sup>2a</sup> E<sup>3</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, rosenfarbes E<sup>2b</sup> E<sup>4</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 178, 18 Was hälften E<sup>1</sup> E<sup>2a</sup>, Was helfen E<sup>2b</sup> E<sup>3</sup> E<sup>4</sup> B<sup>5</sup> C<sup>1</sup>.

### 3. Gedanken über eine alte Aufschrift, Leipzig, 1772

Zu den zwei auf S. 15 meiner Abhandlung beschriebenen Drucken E<sup>a</sup> E<sup>b</sup> kommt noch ein dritter, der demnach durch E<sup>c</sup> zu bezeichnen ist, obschon er wahrscheinlich älter ist als E<sup>b</sup>. An sämtlichen dort angeführten Stellen, abgesehen natürlich von den beiden Spiessen auf S. 5 u. 9, geht E<sup>c</sup> mit E<sup>a</sup>, auch stimmt die Grösse der in diesen beiden gebrauchten fetten Schrift überein, welche in E<sup>b</sup> viel kleiner ist. Dabei macht E<sup>c</sup> eigene Änderungen im Text, die weder in E<sup>a</sup> noch E<sup>b</sup> wiederkehren. Folglich ist anzunehmen, dass E<sup>c</sup> wie E<sup>b</sup> direkt auf E<sup>a</sup> zurückgeht. Folgende Auswahl aus den Varianten wird den neu hinzugekommenen Druck genügend kennzeichnen:

S. 4, 16 Uuterhanen (*Druckf.*) E<sup>c</sup>. 7, 3 als dieser E<sup>ab</sup>, als diese E<sup>c</sup>. 8, 2 mit den Wenigsten E<sup>ac</sup>, mit dem Wenigsten E<sup>b</sup>. 10, 15 Vorurtheile E<sup>ab</sup>, Vortheile E<sup>c</sup>. 11, 13 beleidigten E<sup>c</sup> (*das t steht zu hoch*). 21, 1 berechtigt E<sup>ab</sup>, berechtiget E<sup>c</sup>. 49, 17

freywillges (*Druckf.*) E<sup>c</sup>. 56, 7 was er geschrieben hat E<sup>ab</sup>, was geschrieben hat E<sup>c</sup>. 62, 7 misztranisch (*Druckf.*) E<sup>c</sup>.

4. *Die Abentheuer des Don Sylvio von Rosalva*, Leipzig, 1772

Der fehlende I. Teil des Druckes E<sup>2b</sup> liegt nunmehr vor. Die hier gebrauchte Kopfleiste lässt sich jedoch nicht, wie S. 16 vermutet wurde, als Kennzeichen gebrauchen, da dieselbe willkürlich nach rechts oder links, oder auch symmetrisch nach links und rechts gerichtet ist. Textlich bildet E<sup>2b</sup>, wie im II. Teile, die Vermittelung zwischen E<sup>2a</sup> und E<sup>2c</sup>, dessen Text dann später als Vorlage für die Ausgabe letzter Hand diente. Die in C<sup>1</sup> herübergenommenen Fehler gehen also zum Teil auf E<sup>2b</sup>, zum Teil auf E<sup>2c</sup> zurück. Ausnahmsweise wurden dann in C<sup>4</sup>, der Quart-Ausgabe letzter Hand, einige dieser Fehler bemerkt, und der Text von E<sup>2a</sup> wieder hergestellt. Im grossen und ganzen folgt E<sup>2b</sup> ziemlich treu seiner Vorlage E<sup>2a</sup>: an sämtlichen auf S. 16 verzeichneten Stellen, z. b., findet sich die Lesart von E<sup>2a</sup> auch in E<sup>2b</sup>. Manchmal werden sogar, wie sich aus dem Folgenden ersehen lässt, die Druckfehler von E<sup>2a</sup> mit herübergenommen:

S. 83, 11 dasz Gesicht (*Druckf.*) E<sup>2a</sup>, das Gesicht E<sup>2bc</sup>. 85, 17 verfolgt E<sup>2ac</sup>, versolgt E<sup>2b</sup>. 92, 8 erzählte E<sup>2ac</sup>, erzählte E<sup>2b</sup>. 114, 21 Augbraunen E<sup>2ab</sup>, Augenbraunen E<sup>2c</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 125, 23 Vandyk E<sup>2a</sup>, Vandyck E<sup>2bc</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 131, 19 das ihn . . . befiel E<sup>2a</sup> C<sup>4</sup>, das ihm . . . befiel E<sup>2bc</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 137, 18 Ursachen habe E<sup>2ab</sup>, Ursache habe E<sup>2c</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 141, 18 leiblichste E<sup>2ab</sup>, leibliche E<sup>2c</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 155, 18 Einbildungskraft (*Druckf.*) E<sup>2a</sup>. 172, 9 besann er E<sup>2a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, besonn er E<sup>2bc</sup>. 177, 9 wohlbepackten E<sup>2a</sup>, wohlgepackten E<sup>2bc</sup>, wohl gepackten C<sup>1</sup>, wohl bepackten C<sup>4</sup>. 188, 12 hattten (*Druckf.*) E<sup>2a</sup>. 192, 9 Syldio E<sup>2a</sup>, Sylvio E<sup>2bc</sup>. 195, 15 quäcken E<sup>2a</sup>, quälen E<sup>2bc</sup>, quäken C<sup>1</sup>. 200, 8 Silbermoor E<sup>2a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, Schilbermoor E<sup>2bc</sup>. 211, 6 mit mir E<sup>2a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, zu mir E<sup>2bc</sup>. 211, 18 ihre Prinzessin E<sup>2a</sup>, die Prinzessin E<sup>2bc</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 230, 1 kleinen Republicanern E<sup>2a</sup>, kleinern Republikanern E<sup>2bc</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 230, 4 könnten E<sup>2a</sup>, können E<sup>2bc</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 238, 3 dasz heiszt (*Druckf.*) E<sup>2ab</sup>.

5. *Wielands Neueste Gedichte vom Jahre 1770 bis 1777*

Vom I. Teil dieser neuen, verbesserten Auflage (Weimar, bey Carl Ludolf Hofmann, 1777.) liegen zwei äusserlich übereinstimmende Drucke vor, während der II. Teil in den mir vorliegen-

mplaren von demselben Satze abgezogen ist. Die meisten der Betracht kommenden Stücke waren vorher im *Merkur* (J) erschienen: als Originaldruck (B<sup>4a</sup>) ist also derjenige zu bezeichnen, dessen Lesarten dem Texte des *Merkurs* am nächsten stehen. Die zahlreichen Varianten des Doppeldrucks (B<sup>4b</sup>) sind auch dadurch von grösster Wichtigkeit, dass dieselben zum Teil in die *Auserlesenen Gedichte*, 1784, (B<sup>5</sup>) übergegangen sind, die dann als Vorlage für die Ausgabe letzter Hand (C<sup>1</sup>) benutzt wurden. Warum B<sup>5</sup> einmal dem Texte von E<sup>4a</sup>, ein andermal aber E<sup>4b</sup> folgen sollte, lässt sich nicht so leicht erklären, es sei denn durch die Annahme, dass eventuell noch ein unbekannter, zwischen E<sup>4a</sup> und E<sup>4b</sup> stehender Druck existiert. In der folgenden Auswahl aus den Varianten sind also nicht nur die eigentlichen Lesarten, sondern auch Druckfehler, schiefstehende Buchstaben und ähnliche Merkmale verzeichnet, die am leichtesten zur Feststellung eines etwa unbekannten Doppeldruckes führen werden:

S. 1, Einfaches Blumengewinde als Zierleiste B<sup>4a</sup>, Blumengewinde mit zwei Engeln B<sup>4b</sup>. 26, 12 Laube; B<sup>4a</sup>, Laube, B<sup>4b</sup> B<sup>5</sup>. 36, 4 Ritter, wie einer, der JB<sup>4a</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, Ritter, der B<sup>4b</sup>. 37, 6 goldenen Blumenköpfen JB<sup>4a</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, goldenen Buchstaben B<sup>4b</sup>. 41, 14 auf ein Knie B<sup>4a</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, auf sein Knie B<sup>4b</sup>. 44, 4 Blühte JB<sup>4a</sup>, Blüthe B<sup>4b</sup>. 44, 8 ber Liebesdrang (*Druckf.*) B<sup>4a</sup>. 45, 1 Reimen (akk. pl.) JB<sup>4a</sup>, Reime B<sup>4b</sup>, reim' B<sup>5</sup>. 46, 8 dasz eine JB<sup>4a</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, gar eine B<sup>4b</sup>. 47, 1 Zuletzt B<sup>4a</sup>, Zuleszt B<sup>4b</sup>. 47, 18 müsste dann sich keinem JB<sup>4a</sup>, müsste sich denn keinen B<sup>4b</sup>, müsste sich denn keinem B<sup>5</sup>. 69, 9 Gestalten B<sup>4a</sup>, Gestalt B<sup>4b</sup>. 75, 22 Und so ersparte JB<sup>4a</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, Und ersparte B<sup>4b</sup>. 78, 14 leichteste Mückenstich JB<sup>4a</sup>, leiseste Mückenstich B<sup>4b</sup> B<sup>5</sup>. 78, 16 Art von JB<sup>4a</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, Art bey B<sup>4b</sup>. 86, 12 nun ewig zum JB<sup>4a</sup>, nun zum B<sup>4b</sup> B<sup>5</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 88, 2 selbst; B<sup>4a</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, selbst, B<sup>4b</sup>. 88, 9 Das kleinste B<sup>4a</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, Das kleine B<sup>4b</sup>. 95, 11 dasz sie liebe JB<sup>4a</sup>, dasz sie liebt B<sup>4b</sup> B<sup>5</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 110, 3 psalmodiren B<sup>4a</sup>, spalmodiren B<sup>4b</sup>. 112, 9 ihre schönen B<sup>4a</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, ihre schöne B<sup>4b</sup>. 116, 21 Stirn; B<sup>4a</sup>, Stirn! B<sup>4b</sup> B<sup>5</sup>. 119, 11 mattem B<sup>4a</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, matten B<sup>4b</sup>. 121, 4 frommem B<sup>4a</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, frommen E<sup>4b</sup>. 127, 11 einem B<sup>4a</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, einen B<sup>4b</sup>. 141, 5 wir Arme wallen J, wir arme wallen B<sup>4a</sup>, wir alle wallen B<sup>4b</sup> B<sup>5</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 147, 11 glitsch (*Druckf.*) B<sup>4a</sup>, glitscht B<sup>4b</sup>. 171, 5 die holde B<sup>4a</sup>, dir holde (*Druckf.*) B<sup>4b</sup>. 176, 7 wär es B<sup>4a</sup> B<sup>5</sup>, war es B<sup>4b</sup>. 182, 15 Schöpferskraft JB<sup>4a</sup>, Schöpferkraft B<sup>4b</sup>. 182, 21 Hirngespenst JB<sup>4a</sup>, Hirngespenst der Natur B<sup>4b</sup>. 187, 22 Haselnüsse B<sup>4a</sup>, Hasselnüsse B<sup>4b</sup>. 202, 10 das B<sup>4a</sup>, dasz B<sup>4b</sup>. 211, 4 Strohhalmen B<sup>4a</sup>, Gtrophhalmen B<sup>4b</sup>. 217, 22 Täuschungen B<sup>4a</sup>, Cäuschungen B<sup>4b</sup>.

6. *Neue Götter-Gespräche*, Leipzig, 1791

Den Bibliographen und Wieland-Forschern scheint nur ein Druck dieses Datums bekannt zu sein, dessen Inhalt Seuffert<sup>3</sup> ausführlich verzeichnet. Dieser Druck, zu 268 Seiten in *Fraktur*, auf grobem Papier und ohne Kupfer, ist jedoch nicht der echte Originaldruck, sondern eine Art billiger Volksausgabe, die den Nachdruckern zuvorkommen sollte. Diese Ausgabe lässt sich also mit der (gleichfalls von Göschen veranstalteten) vier-bändigen, sog. geringeren Ausgabe von Goethes *Schriften* (1787-1791) vergleichen, und wird im Folgenden mit der Sigle E<sup>b</sup> bezeichnet.

Der wirkliche Originaldruck E<sup>a</sup> ist in *Antiqua* auf Schreibpapier gedruckt, und enthält 374 Seiten, nebst Titel und Titelkupfer (*Schnorr inv., Geyser sc.*). Beide Drucke tragen auf der letzten Seite den Vermerk: *Berlin, gedruckt bey Johann Georg Langhoff*. Der Titel von E<sup>a</sup> lautet: *Neue | Götter-Gespräche. | Von | C. M. Wieland | Leipzig, | bei Georg Joachim Göschen, | 1791. |* Dagegen heisst es in E<sup>b</sup>: *Neue | Götter-Gespräche | von | C. M. Wieland. | Leipzig, 1791. | bei Georg Joachim Göschen. |* Daneben existiert noch ein dritter Druck E<sup>c</sup>, in Fraktur, ohne Ort und Verleger: *Neue | Götter-Gespräche | Von | C. M. Wieland. | [Vignette] | 1791. |* Er enthält Titel und 301 Seiten. Jördens<sup>4</sup> erwähnt einen zu Karlsruhe erschienenen Nachdruck dieses Jahres, der sich vielleicht als mit E<sup>c</sup> identisch herausstellen wird.

Orthographisch zeichnet sich der Originaldruck E<sup>a</sup> dadurch aus, dass die Hauptwörter gewöhnlich klein geschrieben werden; ferner wird manchmal *â*, *ô* als Zeichen der Länge gesetzt: *pâr, blôfs, mâfs, schâm, bôtsknechte*; das Wort *nazion* wird stets mit 'z' geschrieben.

Die Drucke E<sup>b,c</sup> gehen, wie wir sehen werden, unabhängig von einander auf E<sup>a</sup> zurück, und eigentlich könnte also E<sup>c</sup> schon vor E<sup>b</sup> erschienen sein. Der Druck E<sup>c</sup> folgt seiner Vorlage sehr genau, nur werden die Hauptwörter, wie in E<sup>b</sup>, gross geschrieben. Dagegen sind die Abweichungen des Druckes E<sup>b</sup> sehr zahlreich: sie betreffen nicht nur den eigentlichen Text, sondern auch Orthographie und Interpunktions.

<sup>3</sup> *Prolegomena zu einer Wieland-Ausgabe* vi, S. 41 f.

<sup>4</sup> *Lexikon deutscher Dichter und Prosaisten*, v, 382. Vgl. Jos. Baer & Co., Kat. 623, No. 4539, wo ein bei Schmieder in Carlsruhe, 1791 erschienener Nachdruck angeführt wird.

Man könnte nun fragen, wie erweist sich der mit E<sup>a</sup> bezeichnete Antiquadruck als der echte Originaldruck? Die Antwort ist, derjenige Druck, der mit einer etwa vorhandenen früheren Ausgabe am genauesten übereinstimmt, ist der richtige Originaldruck, der auch im allgemeinen den korrekteren Text aufweisen wird. Es trifft sich nun, dass die den Schluss des Buches bildenden Gespräche schon im *Neuen Teutschen Merkur* (Sept.-Dez. 1790) erschienen waren. Indem nun E<sup>a</sup> an allen bezeichnenden Stellen mit dem Texte des *Merkurs* übereinstimmt, wird die Ursprünglichkeit des hier vorliegenden Textes über allen Zweifel erhoben.<sup>5</sup> In den folgenden Stellenangaben sind Seite und Zeile von E<sup>a</sup> und (in Klammern) E<sup>b</sup> gegeben; die Sigle J bezeichnet die Lesart im *Merkur*, C<sup>1</sup> die des 25. Bandes der Oktav-Ausgabe letzter Hand, 1796:

- 217, 9 (158, 19) Epicteten JE<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, Epictete E<sup>b</sup>. 218, 2 (15<sup>a</sup>, 7) zu seiner JE<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, nach seiner E<sup>b</sup>. 230, 13 (168, 10) allen unsrern Kräften aufbieten JE<sup>ac</sup>, alle unsrere Kräfte aufbieten E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 254, 9 (184, 23) Augbrauen JE<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, Augenbrauen E<sup>b</sup>. 255, 8 (185, 17) verlohrte sich, dächte ich, der Mühe JE<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, lohnte, dächte ich, die Mühe E<sup>b</sup>. 259, 9 (188, 25) seit meiner Zeit JE<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, seit einiger Zeit E<sup>b</sup>. 268, 12 (195, 12) bin nie kein groszer JE<sup>ac</sup>, bin nie ein groszer E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 284, 15 (206, 19) man noch nicht gedacht J, noch niemand nicht gedacht E<sup>ac</sup>, noch niemand gedacht E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 287, 20 (209, 4) weiser . . . worden sind JE<sup>ac</sup>, weiser . . . geworden sind E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 364, 11 (261, 20) Ver-  
nunftsgründe JE<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, Vernunftgründe E<sup>b</sup>.

An mehreren dieser Stellen stimmt C<sup>1</sup> mit E<sup>b</sup> überein; dazu kommen noch andere derselben Art:

- 48, 15 (34, 23) mich nichts kostete E<sup>ac</sup>, mir nichts kostete E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>; ähnlich 53, 18; 97, 15; 171, 16. Dagegen steht 95, 14 (68, 21) mir gekostet E<sup>abc</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 38, 6 (27, 22) schwindlichtes E<sup>ac</sup>, schwindliches E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>; ähnlich 136, 18 (99, 24). 82, 7 (59, 14) drolichter E<sup>ac</sup>, drolliger E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 198, 11 (145, 3) bucklichte E<sup>ac</sup>, buckelige E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 78, 9, 13 (56, 18, 22) Augenbrauen E<sup>ac</sup>, Augenbrauen E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 90, 20 (65, 15) auf dem Wahne E<sup>ac</sup>, in dem Wahne E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 72, 16 (52, 20) mifbraucht E<sup>ac</sup>, gemisbraucht E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>; dagegen 300, 21 (218, 16) mifskannt E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, gemisckannt E<sup>b</sup>. 281, 16 (204, 16) fodern E<sup>ac</sup>, fordern E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>; ähnlich 209, 13; 216, 22; 349, 11.

<sup>5</sup> Zu bemerken ist ferner, dass den Rezensenten in der *Allgemeinen deutschen Bibliothek* (Bd. 112, S. 83) und in der *Allgemeinen Literatur-Zeitung* (1794, No. 209) Exemplare mit 374 Seiten, d. h., des Antiquadrucks, vorlagen.

Trotz der Übereinstimmung zwischen E<sup>b</sup> und C<sup>1</sup> ist nicht anzunehmen, dass der eine Druck dem andern als Vorlage gedient habe, denn es handelt sich in jedem Falle um Änderungen, die jeder unabhängig von dem andern machen konnte. Viel zahlreicher als diese Übereinstimmungen zwischen E<sup>b</sup> und C<sup>1</sup> sind übrigens die Stellen, an denen C<sup>1</sup> mit E<sup>a</sup> geht, während E<sup>b</sup> kleinere unauffällige Fehler macht, und Änderungen in der Interpunktions vornimmt, die doch wenigstens zum Teil in C<sup>1</sup> wieder zum Vorschein kommen müssten, wenn dieser Druck von E<sup>b</sup> abstammte. Dies ist jedoch durchaus nicht der Fall:

S. 3/4 (3, 7) es sich nicht der mühe verlohnte E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, es nicht die Mühe lohnte E<sup>b</sup>. 5, 16 (4, 13) trotz dem naseweisen schäker E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, trotz des naseweisen Schäkers E<sup>b</sup>. 7, 21 (6, 3) ist sich E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, ist, sich E<sup>b</sup>. 8, 5 (6, 8) nicht wie E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, nicht, wie E<sup>b</sup>. 9, 5 (7, 2) alles was E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, alles, was E<sup>b</sup>. Es liessen sich noch etwa 130 Stellen dieser Art anführen, an denen E<sup>b</sup> einen Nebensatz durch ein Komma absetzt, während C<sup>1</sup> fast ausnahmslos mit E<sup>a</sup> geht. 10, 2 (7, 15) an einem pár kleinigkeiten E<sup>a</sup>, an einem Paar Kleinigkeiten E<sup>c</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, an ein paar Kleinigkeiten E<sup>b</sup>. 37, 7 (27, 6) was du dir selbst bewußt bist E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, wessen du dir . . . E<sup>b</sup>. 54, 15 (39, 3) erlediget E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, entlediget E<sup>b</sup>. 90, 18 (65, 14) keine andere (akk. pl.) E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, keine anderen E<sup>b</sup>. 145, 3 (105, 14) diese fanatischen E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, diese fanatische (nom. pl.) E<sup>b</sup>; ähnlich 321, 16. 96, 2, 6 (69, 3, 6) Caesarn (pl.) E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, Caesare E<sup>b</sup>. 123, 2 (89, 20) Da giebst du E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, Du gibst E<sup>b</sup>. 147, 3 (106, 22) Pontifexe selbst werden E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, Pontifexe werden E<sup>b</sup>. 148, 18 (108, 5) wem er will E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, wenn er will E<sup>b</sup>. 170, 15 (125, 5) im Latium E<sup>ac</sup>, im Lazio C<sup>1</sup>, in Latium E<sup>b</sup>. 240, 1 (174, 24) angelegten J E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, angelegentlichsten E<sup>b</sup>. 279, 19 (203, 8) alten Pflichten E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, allen Pflichten E<sup>b</sup>.

Auf die Textgeschichte hat also E<sup>b</sup> keinen Einfluss gehabt: dagegen ist es sehr möglich, dass Lesarten wie *mir kosten, alle unsere Kräfte aufbieten, die Mühe lohnte*, usw. vom Dichter selbst angeordnet wurden, als ihm die fertigen Bogen von E<sup>a</sup> vorlagen, denn es ist kaum anzunehmen, dass ein Setzer oder Faktor sich diese Freiheit nehmen würde.

Zum Schluss seien noch einige Druckfehler und auffallende Lesarten angeführt, die zur Entdeckung von etwa ähnlichen Doppeldrucken dienen mögen:

28, 12 (21, 1) Livia E<sup>ac</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, Liva E<sup>b</sup>. 32, 8 (23, 19) schäm E<sup>a</sup>, Scham E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, Schaam E<sup>c</sup>. 58, 1 (41, 11) vereinigen E<sup>ab</sup>, ver-

rinigen E<sup>c</sup>. 71, 2 (51, 15) Gott hätte abbilden sollen E<sup>ab</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, Gott abbilden sollen E<sup>c</sup>. 76, 9 (55, 10) werden E<sup>ac</sup>, werdrn E<sup>b</sup>. 115, 10 (83, 10) nectar E<sup>a</sup>, Nectar E<sup>c</sup>, Hectar E<sup>b</sup>. Z. 12 pantomische E<sup>b</sup>. 122, 17 (89, 15) bemächtigen; E<sup>ac</sup>, bemächtigen; E<sup>b</sup> (*das i verkehrt*). 135, 21 (99, 9) da sie sich E<sup>ab</sup>, da sich E<sup>c</sup>. 143, 3 (104, 3) Teophrasten E<sup>a</sup>, Theophrasten E<sup>c</sup>, Teophraste E<sup>b</sup>. 143, 22 (104, 19) wem als sich E<sup>ab</sup>, wem an sich E<sup>c</sup>. 204, 14 (149, 13) in einem E<sup>ab</sup>, in seinem E<sup>c</sup>. 270, 18 (196, 24) ware (*Druckf.*) E<sup>ac</sup>, wäre E<sup>b</sup>. 327, 1 (236, 10) und sittlichkeit E<sup>a</sup>, und Sittlichkeit E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, fehlt E<sup>c</sup>. 351, 7 (252, 18) keines weges E<sup>a</sup>, keinesweges E<sup>c</sup>, keines Weges E<sup>b</sup>.

#### 7. *Geheime Geschichte des Philosophen Peregrinus Proteus*, 1791

Hier existiert gleichfalls neben der besseren eine geringere Ausgabe, die sogar als Nachdruck figuriert. Der Titel von E<sup>a</sup> lautet: *Geheime Geschichte des Philosophen Peregrinus Proteus. Von C. M. Wieland. Erster [Zweyter] Theil. Leipzig, bey Georg Joachim Göschen, 1791.* Die Ausgabe ist auf Schreibpapier gedruckt und enthält 352 + 424 Seiten, dazu zwei Titelkupfer von H. Lips. Am Schluss des zweiten Bandes der Vermerk: *Leipzig, gedruckt bei Christian Friedrich Solbrig.* Die geringere Ausgabe auf schlechtem Papier hat den Titel: *Geheime Geschichte . . . Zwey Theile. Franckfurth und Leipzig, 1791*, und enthält 140 + 190 Seiten, nebst Titel und Titelkupfer zum ersten Bande. Der zweite Band hat nur den Halbtitel: *Geheime Geschichte des Philosophen Peregrinus Proteus. Zweyter Theil*, wonach also die zwei Bände zusammengebunden werden sollten. Titelkupfer und Titel bilden ein zusammenhängendes Blatt. Da nun das Titelkupfer mit dem des zweiten Bandes von E<sup>a</sup> identisch ist, so ist auch E<sup>b</sup> zweifellos ein echter, von Göschen selbst veranstalteter Druck, der durch einfachere Ausstattung und billigeren Preis den Nachdruckern das Handwerk legen sollte. Der vermeinte Nachdruck ist also ein weiteres Seitenstück zu Göschens geringerer Ausgabe von Goethes *Schriften*, während der Originaldruck E<sup>a</sup> sich mit der acht-bändigen Goethe-Ausgabe vergleichen lässt, die ja in derselben Druckerei hergestellt wurde. Besseres und stärkeres Papier verleiht jedoch der Wieland-Ausgabe ein schöneres Aussehen.

Im allgemeinen bietet die geringere Ausgabe E<sup>b</sup> des *Peregrinus* den schlechteren Text, was ja von vornherein von jedem jüngeren, wenn auch echten Drucke zu erwarten ist, der ohne Mithilfe des Verfassers veranstaltet wird. Folgende Auswahl aus den Lesarten

wird dies klar genug darstellen. Die an erster Stelle angeführte Seiten- und Zeilenzahl bezieht sich auf E<sup>a</sup>, die eingeklammerte auf E<sup>b</sup>:

I. Bd. S. 89, 9 (36, 22) alle mögliche E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, alle möglichen E<sup>b</sup>. 112, 10 (45, 12) geheimen Aufträgen E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, kleinen Aufträgen E<sup>b</sup>. 124, 19 (50, 9) befürchten E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, besorgen E<sup>b</sup>. 210, 1 (84, 7) weiszem Gewande E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, weiszem Gewande E<sup>b</sup>. 218, 10 (87, 22) eigenen Schlüssel E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, besonderen Schlüssel E<sup>b</sup>. 221, 19 (88, 37) Mittheilungen E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, Mittheilung E<sup>b</sup>. 252, 5 (101, 2) dunkle, oder, besser zu reden, gar keine Vorstellungen E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, dunkle Vorstellungen E<sup>b</sup>. 253, 4 (101, 15) vergeblichen Versuchs E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, dergleichen Versuchs E<sup>b</sup>. 276, 7 (110, 24) diesem unverhofften E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, diesem so unverhofften E<sup>b</sup>. 293, 12 (117, 16) einsamen Nacht E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, einzigen Nacht E<sup>b</sup>. 299, 10 (119, 31) noch entfernen E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, entfernen E<sup>b</sup>. 318, 13 (127, 10) sie ihre Zärtlichkeit E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, sie Zärtlichkeit E<sup>b</sup>. II. Bd. S. 4, 7 (3, 16) ganzes Jahr lang E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, ganzes Jahr E<sup>b</sup>. 9, 2 (5, 32) vorragenden E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, hervorragenden E<sup>b</sup>. 118, 15 (54, 31) Antoninen E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, Antonine E<sup>b</sup>. 241, 4 (108, 36) mehr Liehaber anzulocken E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, mehr anzulocken E<sup>b</sup>. 264, 5 (119, 7) zu beydem E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, zu beyden E<sup>b</sup>. 321, 12 (144, 9) gestehe ich E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, gestehe ich es E<sup>b</sup>. 331, 11 (148, 21) Leidenschaften E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, Leidenschaft E<sup>b</sup>. 343, 4 (153, 23) zu Erfindung E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, zur Erfindung E<sup>b</sup>. 410, 3 (184, 12) durch Hunger, oder Opium, oder E<sup>a</sup> C<sup>1</sup>, durch Hunger, durch Opium, oder E<sup>b</sup>.

An obigen Stellen, wie auch im allgemeinen, geht die Ausgabe letzter Hand mit dem Originaldruck E<sup>a</sup>: dagegen finden sich andere, verhältnismässig seltene Fälle, an denen E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup> übereinstimmen. Hier handelt es sich jedoch meistens um Druck- oder Interpunktionsfehler, usw., die jeder Druck unabhängig von dem andern machen oder verbessern konnte, so dass Berührung zwischen E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup> kaum anzunehmen ist:

I. Bd. S. 6, 1 (2, 19) im Jahr E<sup>a</sup>, im Jahre E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 32, 13 (13, 32) ihm . . . hinausbieten E<sup>a</sup>, ihn . . . hinausbieten E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 82, 15 (34, 4) die verschiedene Arten E<sup>a</sup>, die verschiedenen Arten E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 88, 6 (36, 6) bey Ihm E<sup>a</sup>, bey ihm E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 91, 6 (37, 13) so gar E<sup>a</sup>, sogar E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 99, 16 (40, 21) so wohl E<sup>a</sup>, sowohl E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 182, 13 (73, 19) bekleiden E<sup>a</sup>, bekleiden E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. II. Bd. S. 9, 10 (6, 2) Augenbrauen E<sup>a</sup>, Augenbrauen E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 34, 14 (17, 21) erkundigen? E<sup>a</sup>, erkundigen; E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 172, 19 (78, 35) habe; E<sup>a</sup>, habe, E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 187, 3 (85, 3) erforderliche E<sup>a</sup>, erforderliche E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 237, 2 (107, 8) Versinnlichung E<sup>a</sup>, Versinnlichung E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 254, 5

(114, 27) verführischen E<sup>a</sup>, verführerischen E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 273, 4 (123, 7) Mytilene E<sup>a</sup>, Mitylene E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 326, 20 (146, 21) muszte: E<sup>a</sup>, muszte, E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>. 330, 14 (148, 7) von Himmel E<sup>a</sup>, vom Himmel E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup>.

Ferner ist zu bemerken, dass E<sup>a</sup> durchweg *damals, jemals, dreymal, zumal, Gastmal*, usw. schreibt, wofür E<sup>b</sup> C<sup>1</sup> *damahls, jemahls, dreymahl, zumahl, Gastmahl*, usw. setzen. Dies sind jedoch nur Eigenarten der betreffenden Setzer, die auch in der geringeren Ausgabe von Goethes *Schriften* in genau derselben Weise zum Vorschein kommen.

Schliesslich seien noch einige Stellen angeführt, an denen der eine oder der andere Druck auffallende Lesarten, meistens Druckfehler, aufweist, die zur Entdeckung etwaiger noch unbekannter Doppeldrucke dienen mögen:

I. Bd. S. 158, 13 (64, 3) Sott der Gonne E<sup>a</sup>, Gott der Sonne E<sup>b</sup>. 195, 7 (78, 19) der Weit (*Druckf.*) E<sup>a</sup>, der Welt E<sup>b</sup>. 209, 4 (83, 33) zerfleiszen (*Druckf.*) E<sup>a</sup>, zerflieszen E<sup>b</sup>. 251, 19 (100, 35) vielleicht E<sup>a</sup>, vielleicht E<sup>b</sup>. II. Bd. S. 85, 6 (39, 33) Tode (*Druckf.*) E<sup>a</sup>, Todte E<sup>b</sup>. 86, 11 (40, 17) In beyderley Fäle (*Druckf.*) E<sup>a</sup>, In beyderley Fällen E<sup>b</sup>. 118, 10 (54, 27) die zum E<sup>a</sup>, die die zum (*Druckf.*) E<sup>b</sup>. 265, 2 (119, 21) ich E<sup>a</sup>, sich (*Druckf.*) E<sup>b</sup>. 305, 15 (137, 14) geworfen hatte E<sup>a</sup>, geworfen hätten (*Druckf.*) E<sup>b</sup>. 308, 7 (138, 19) gleichgültig E<sup>a</sup>, gleichgültig (*Druckf.*) E<sup>b</sup>. 374, 1 (167, 31) zwischen den (*Druckf.*) E<sup>a</sup>, zwischen dem E<sup>b</sup>.

W. KURRELMEYER.

---

*John Keats: his Life and Poetry, his Friends, Critics, and After-Fame.* By Sir SIDNEY COLVIN. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1917.

In honor of the one hundredth anniversary of the publication of Keats's first volume of poems, Sir Sidney Colvin's long-awaited new biography of the poet has appeared. So secure, today, is the position of Keats in English literature that no study of him need be in any degree a defense. The world of critical readers pays homage to the fineness, the sincerity, and the imaginative genius of his work, and recognizes the winsome vigor of his personality.

Increasing study of his *Letters* has shown his lofty aspiration, his resolute, unsparing self-criticism, and his intensely keen observing power. The *Letters* alone would prove his title to "eternity of fame," for they reveal possibilities, promises which he had not time to fulfil. In academic studies teachers find that the reading of the poems of Keats has a uniquely dynamic effect upon the critical powers of students, because the daring of Keats's experiments, the very swiftness of his development, the perfection of his best work teach quickly and attractively the essential truths of genuine poetic creativeness.

The new life will, of course, take its place as an authoritative contribution of assured permanence in the annals of literary criticism. It contains much new material, though none of very startling importance. The accumulation of specific evidence, the use of all available means of investigation, give the book precedence over all other studies of Keats. The author's keen insight and his sympathetic depth of feeling are already known to students through the earlier biography, published in 1887. Designed for the general reader as well as for the student, the book is notable, first, for its wealth of illustrative material, including quotations from the letters and the poems, so that any reader unfamiliar with the writings of the poet would find in the volume a satisfactory introduction to the most representative work of Keats. Sir Sidney has given a carefully detailed account of outer events and of probable inner influences affecting Keats, and has interpreted with greatest skill the steps of growth in the evolution of a poet's thought and art, weaving together fact and critical comment upon fact into a highly effective narrative. Investigation of documents and memorials, especially those in possession of Lord Crewe and of Mr. Pierpont Morgan, has revealed much detailed information which, fused and related, gives us an absorbingly, persuasively real portrait of Keats. Of especial significance are the studies of the poet's friends. Leigh Hunt receives unusually adequate and just treatment, Haydon is interpreted with discrimination, although the inclusion of pictures of both of these men is not a wholly kind action on the part of the biographer. Dilke, Brown, and the incomparable Severn appear before us in pages that vivify many hours and days. In the account of the experiences in Rome, the biographer chooses his material with complete success in avoiding the merely harrowing, and in presenting the details which picture for

us the courage, the poverty, loneliness, and suffering of the poet aware of powers never to find expression, and conscious to the utmost of the terrible, relentless wasting of artistic maturity,

Before his pen had glean'd his teeming brain.

In the examination of sources and influences affecting the production of the separate poems, Sir Sidney has avoided the danger of being merely an editor, and has addressed himself to the task of showing what were the conceptions, the ideals, the dominating interests that shaped the imaginative life of John Keats. The reader is given clear introduction to the formative elements that stimulated the poet to expression and guided his expression to more firmly and finely wrought beauty. The study of *Endymion*, for example, touches all the important aspects, giving the professed student as well as the novice new and delicate discriminations regarding the way in which versification, diction, style, and ideas were touched to fine issues by Keats's delight in the poets of the English Renaissance. Spenser, Shakespeare, Chapman, Drayton, Browne, Milton, the manifest progenitors of the nineteenth century poet, are approached with suggestive analysis that interprets the appeal they had for Keats. Side by side with this discussion of the English poets, there is developed a subtle, brief study of classicism in Keats. At a time like the present, when the classics are subject to a temporary decline in prestige, it is pleasant to note how appreciatively the critic shows the significance of Keats's response to the Greek past. Beauty finding expression in Greek sculpture, in Greek myth, or in Greek poetry is commemorated by Keats, not as mere loveliness of sense-impression but as a perpetuation of the fine moods, the fresh, vivid experience of a world where life could never pass into nothingness.

Perhaps, in considering the influence of the Middle Ages upon Keats, Sir Sidney speaks less authoritatively, yet his treatment of *La Belle Dame sans Merci* and *The Eve of St. Mark* shows a true instinct for medievalism. Attention should be paid to the critic's plea for the right version of *La Belle Dame sans Merci*, a plea based upon study of the history of the text, and also upon the soundest aesthetic criticism. It is in connection with this poem that the differences between the biography published by Sir Sidney in the English Men of Letters Series, thirty years ago, and the new biography are most apparent. Students who have made con-

stant and appreciative use of the earlier work will still be loyal to it, because it is unequalled for vivid, finely-phrased, and penetrating analysis. The new volume is more sedate, appeals more directly to the reader's sense of fact, and less directly to his sense of the awe and majesty of poetry. The later volume incorporates matter from the earlier one, to quote the author, "to the amount perhaps of forty or fifty pages in all."

Aside from details of biography and analysis of sources, the new book contains important illustrative material. Most significant of all is the full-page reproduction of the electrotype of the life-mask of Keats. Certainly there has not hitherto been published a portrait of Keats that so brings before us the grave, controlled beauty of his profile, with its strength and firmness of line. Other portraits are given in this book, including, as a rather unsatisfactory frontispiece, the posthumous painting by Severn, reproduced in color. Several illustrations of Greek sculpture in connection with the *Ode on a Grecian Urn*, and a reproduction of an engraving of Claude's *The Enchanted Castle* are exceedingly valuable for students. A list of books owned by Keats is given in the Appendix. There is an Index of unusual fullness and usefulness, but no formal bibliography appears, an omission that is to be deplored in a book as monumental as this. However, acknowledgments are made in various places to the studies of Professor de Sélincourt, and to the work of other men distinguished in this field. The work upon Keats in France is definitely ruled out of consideration, hence M. Lucien Wolff's extended biography receives no critical attention. In general, the student will wish that more history of the criticism were included.

Richness of suggestion, steadiness of critical viewpoint, knowledge of literature and of art characterize every page of this life of Keats, and always the reader feels the sureness and the accuracy of the critic's method. As a memorial to Keats the volume will be of wide-reaching importance, arousing enthusiasm for the poet and quickening meditation on the fundamental problems of poetic art. For more than thirty years Sir Sidney Colvin has been "a mission'd spirit." Now that his work is completed, all students of Keats will be glad to express their admiration of the biographer's supremely loyal and devoted service to "the truth of Imagination."

MARTHA HALE SHACKFORD.

Wellesley College.

*The Spirit of Modern German Literature.* By LUDWIG LEWISOHN.  
New York, B. W. Huebsch, 1916.

To give within the compass of one hundred pages a survey of modern German literature is either to court disaster by the mere enumeration (to satisfy the demand for completeness) of many writers, whom the critic time has not yet eliminated from contemporary perspective, or, by confining criticism to representative literary phenomena, to invite, through the exclusion or disproportionate treatment of this or that favorite, the charge of attempting to forestall the verdict of time from those who, by their very act of protest, are guilty of the same charge. Professor Lewisohn has wisely chosen the second method and in his book, which he calls, not a survey, but *The Spirit of Modern German Literature*, he has given a critical estimate of the significant exponents of modern German literary movements. These significant exponents he treats under a new classification: 1. The Search for Reality. 2. The Search for Interpretation. Absolute rigidity of classification need hardly be demanded, yet Professor Lewisohn's treatment of the predominant moods of modern German writers under the subdivisions of these classes seems to justify to a remarkable degree his new formulation. The subdivisions under The Search for Reality are: 1. The Nation and Its Literature; 2. The Novel of Doctrinal Naturalism (Wilhelm von Polenz and Georg von Ompteda); 3. The Naturalistic Lyric (Detlev von Lilieneron and His Group); 4. The Drama of Hauptmann and Schnitzler; 5. The Novel of Pure Naturalism (Clara Viebig, Gustav Frenssen, Thomas Mann, Arthur Schnitzler); 6. Reality and the Moral Life. The subdivisions under The Search for Interpretation are: 1. The Protest of Personality (Friedrich Nietzsche); 2. The Struggle of Personality for Liberation (Richard Dehmel); 3. The Expression of Personality through Beauty (Rainer Maria Rilke, Stefan George, Hugo von Hofmannsthal); 4. The Interpretative Novel (Ricarda Huch); 5. The Interpretative Drama; 6. Goethe and the Spirit of Modern Germany.

Hauptmann's established position in the world of letters and Professor Lewisohn's interpretation of him in his *Modern Drama* and the excellent introductions to his translations are matters of common knowledge to the student of literature. Professor Lewisohn

adds nothing new to our knowledge or to his own analysis of Hauptmann in his latest book; yet in his summarizations he has combined his rare gift of expression with a succinctness so satisfying as to make them stand out as masterpieces of critical art. Take, for example, his description of Hauptmann's characters:

"His men and women are impelled by hunger, by lust, by the primitive will to power, by aspiration. They have little eloquence of speech or grace of gesture, but move us as by our own woes, which are also the unconquerable woes of all the world. The disharmonies between themselves and the universe are tragic and final. Humble souls that they are, they perish of elemental needs and are crucified in great causes. They are not beautiful, they are not wise, they are not pure: they are only broken and imperfect members of the family of man. Yet what rare spiritual energies they can wring from their confused and frustrated souls."

Nietzsche, under the caption "The Protest of Personality," is treated as a poet-philosopher and the salient pronouncements in *Thus spake Zarathustra* are subjected to a critical analysis. It is, however, by emphasizing Nietzsche as the poet, and particularly, the stylist, that Professor Lewisohn has rendered German literary criticism a distinct service. He finds, quite rightly, that "the appearance of a stylist of this order of rank and originality in a literature not historically notable for its accomplishment in prose had very far-reaching results."

These results are apparent in the sudden rise of the German novel, which up to the modern period had lagged behind the lyric and the drama. Professor Lewisohn's treatment of the modern German novel is particularly welcome, for there has been lacking in English any adequate review of it. Again one must admire the clarity of critical vision and analysis in such a passage as his definition of doctrinal and pure naturalism, which is contained in his criticism of *Sylvester von Geyer*:

"It forms a link between the novel of doctrinal naturalism and the novel of pure naturalism: doctrinal naturalism that observes and then arranges its observations in order to prove, proclaim or justify an opinion or doctrine: pure naturalism that yields itself to the physical and spiritual texture of human life and makes a record too deep for special pleading, too complex—like that life itself—to be interpreted by intellectualistic formulæ."

Poetical insight, both in the analysis and the translation of

poems, characterizes the chapters on the lyric. Yet his treatment of Rilke, George, and Hofmannsthal will be sure to find objectors in those who, though conscious of the rare beauty of their lyrics, cannot somehow escape the feeling that concreteness of image is too frequently sacrificed for impeccable form. These objectors feel that George is elusive and difficult, and not alone because "certain orthographic and typographical peculiarities of his books have given that impression."

The value of the book is enhanced by a commentary which contains among other material several excellent translations. But the most valuable pages in the book are not those on modern German literature; they are those in which are contained one critic's conception of the critic's equipment:

"To every poet, to every 'maker' in the wider sense, a god, in the fine words of Goethe, has given the power to express what he has suffered. The method of expression is necessarily, at least in its most obvious aspects, traditional. Here certain standards may be applied. The soul of the work, however, like that soul from whose experience it grew, is unique. It is a new thing born into this immemorial world. If it were not, if it could be judged by critical formulæ derived from the books of old—these would suffice us. Is it not clear, then, that what the critic needs for his task is, above all, a deep sense of the nature of life and a sensitive perception of living beauty? How rarely, among us, does he possess these qualifications! In the most scholarly of our weeklies a critic has recently been reviewing a number of modern plays. He does not like the people discussed in these plays, and the problems discussed fill him with moral discomfort. But he, poor man, mistakes the dislikes and revulsions bred in him by the temper of his spiritual parish for the laws of a changeless order, and rashly proceeds to lecture such profound and subtle masters as Jules Lemaître and Arthur Schnitzler upon the unveracity and perversity of their report of the life of man. Such a critic, evidently, needs humility—a humility and wisdom that will not come to him through another course in the history of literature, but through a course in hunger, love and grief. To know life, then, directly and not through the mist of tribal taboos, to be sensitive to beauty and aware of its power to assume forms ever new and strange—these are the precious parts of a critic's equipment. Nor will a critic so equipped fail of his reward. For books approved in his spirit will have the best chance of being memorable, since they will have sprung, whatever their imperfections, from the perennial source of all true art—the struggling, agonizing, human soul."

JOHN WHYTE.

*New York University.*

*Tendencies in Modern American Poetry.* By AMY LOWELL. The Macmillan Company, 1917.

The new movement in modern American poetry, according to Miss Amy Lowell, consists of three stages. The first is represented by Mr. Edwin Arlington Robinson and Mr. Robert Frost, whose work is realistic, direct, and simple; the second by Mr. Edgar Lee Masters and Mr. Carl Sandburg, whose poetry is "the most revolutionary that America has produced"; the third by the Imagists, "H. D." and Mr. John Gould Fletcher, who "may properly be said to be entering upon the last stage of this 'movement,' and whose work may very well be called evolutionary." Very appropriately Miss Lowell gives special consideration to the Imagists and their creed, not merely because she herself is of them, but because they constitute to her mind the most striking development of modern poetry. And yet when the creed is examined in its six articles, we find, as she confesses, nothing new but principles "fallen into desuetude." Is it possible to gather from them a clear conception of what is meant by Imagist poetry?

The first article of this creed is: "To use the language of common speech, but to employ always the *exact* word, not the nearly-exact, nor the merely decorative word." Hence away with all inversions, *clichés*, et hoc genus omne of ordinary poetry. "Battlemented clouds" join the deus ex machina and waxen-figure spooks in the limbo of worn-out conventions. But haven't all the college Rhetorics from Hill to Linn told us the same thing as a requirement of all good prose and verse? The second article is: "To create new rhythms—as the expression of new moods—and not to copy old rhythms which merely echo old moods." And every original poet does likewise, as Shakespeare and Milton with their blank verse and Tennyson with his quatrain. Of course, the special creation in rhythm today is free verse, of which later. The third tenet is: "To allow absolute freedom in the choice of subject." The poets have always resisted the critics in this respect, and the world has supported the poets when they treat their subject poetically. It is not the subject so much as the imaginative mind that counts. Article four: "To present an image (hence the name 'Imagist') . . . Poetry should render particulars exactly and not deal in vague generalities, however magnificent and sonorous."

This should surely give the key to the Imagist creed, but does it do so? Imagism is "a clear presentation [not representation] of whatever the poet wishes to convey," whether it be something sensuously or emotionally comprehended. But wherein is Imagism in this respect different from any poetry that seeks to visualize the concrete or make vivid an emotional experience? The fifth article is: "To produce poetry that is hard and clear, never blurred and indefinite," which is virtually included in articles one and four, and is just as true of legitimate as of Imagist poetry. The last rule is that "concentration is of the very essence of poetry,"—a rule Mr. Fletcher violates as frequently as the youthful Keats, and "H. D." not more rigorously obeys than Browning.

Now Miss Lowell contends that there is something so characteristic in the Imagist poetry that it should be distinguished at once from the work of the first-stagers in the new movement, Mr. Robinson and Mr. Frost, and Professor Erskine should not have made the colossal blunder of calling these two poets Imagists. But Miss Lowell admits that the analysis of rules and tenets and all such mechanical labor will not give us the touchstone to this style. One must feel it, like the grand style of which Arnold speaks. But just as one can distinguish by purely mechanical means Milton's blank verse from Shakespeare's and Keats's heroic couplet from Chaucer's or Pope's, surely one should be able to indicate by far better guides than the dangerous feelings the distinction between Imagist and all other poetry. One is inclined to suspect that the difference is rather one of degree than of kind, of eccentricity than of new creation. Thus "H. D.'s" *Oread*—

Whirl up, sea—  
Whirl your pointed pines,  
Splash your great pines  
On our rocks,  
Hurl your green over us,  
Cover us with your pools of fir.—

is imagism because it is not anything else, for only an Imagist would whirl pines, splash great pines, and when it was all over, cover us with pools of fir (the spelling is correct). So also we discover a great fondness for cyclamen with its stiff ivory and bright fire petals, stagnant ash barrels, egg-white mist, pale and languid terraces, lacquered mandarin moments, etc. It is not so

much the exact as the esoteric word that is chosen. A dictionary is of little value.

One is disposed to emphasize the second article in the creed as the most important and to regard free verse as the distinctive mark of this poetry, though the Imagists deny that it is so. Miss Lowell includes an exposition of this metrical form with the conclusion that it "has no absolute rules, it would not be 'free' if it had." So far as I know it is therefore the only free thing in the universe. According to the Imagists the unit of this verse is the strophe and each strophe is a complete circle; and within this charmed circle one may apparently do what one pleases. Moreover, the circle is not limited in size, nor "need the times allowed to negotiate it be always the same. There is room here for an infinite number of variations." And Miss Lowell illustrates from the *Oread* quoted above. This poem or strophe or circle is made up of five cadences, corresponding to the lines, which again are made up of time units in no sense syllabic. There are two such units in the first, second, and fourth lines, and three in the third and fifth. And so on, "Till we exclaim—'But where's music, the dickens?'" And we are no nearer comprehending the rhythm of this verse than we were to understanding the actual significance of imagism from the other tenets of the creed. Is it only for the elect to know it?

In her treatment of the six poets who make up her volume Miss Lowell is singularly uneven. The short biographical sketches are appreciative and illuminating. She is particularly felicitous in her comparative estimates of the several poets, and very aptly puts each in his proper niche. Her enthusiasm, however, is inclined every now and then to run away with her judgment. And in matters of detail she makes statements that will not stand the mildest acid test. She seems to have a strange notion of the academic or classicist conception of metrics. Thus she instances Mr. Frost's somewhat ambiguous line,

Mary sat musing on the lamp-flame at the table

as shocking the elder taste with its accent on the last syllable of 'Mary' and on 'on' and 'at.' Did Miss Lowell ever hear of trochaic inversion? Or has she never read such lines as these of Shelley:

And splinter and knead down my children's bones,  
All I bring forth, to one void mass battering and blending

which are as romantic as Frost's,

I crossed the river and swung round the mountain.

Excellent as much of Mr. Frost's work is, is it not superlative praise to rank it with Burns's or Synge's? And what shall we say of such a pronouncement as this, that Mr. Robinson's poetry is "cribbed, cabin'd and confined" [sic] to a remarkable degree, but it is undeniably, magnificently noble"—which last three words one might apply to Milton's verse but not to any of much less rank. In an interesting analysis of Mr. Robinson's *Isaac and Archibald*, Miss Lowell quotes the following:

They were old men,  
And I may laugh at them because I knew them.

And then she adds this illuminating comment: "Does the poet really laugh? Assuredly not, laughter is the one emotion [sic] which he has not at command. Does it mean a sneer? Less still. The poet does not sneer. The life he sees about him is too solemn and too sad. The line is cryptic, because it really means just a question, pitying, fearful, cast into space to go knocking about among the stars." In the words of another poet,

And still they were the same bright, patient stars.

Or again about Mr. Robinson's *Richard Cory*, quoted entire and ending with the lines,

And Richard Cory, one calm summer night,  
Went home and put a bullet through his head.

Miss Lowell makes this statement: "In four words, 'one calm summer night,' is set a background for the tragedy which brings the bullet shot crashing across our ear drums with the shock of an earthquake." Accustomed as we are to the *Spoon River Anthology*, we know that bullet is due in the last lines; we are not so easily shocked.

Miss Lowell has labored valiantly and with undaunted enthusiasm to show that "there is a new spirit permeating the work of American poets," and in this she has undoubtedly succeeded. The revolutionary spirit in Mr. Masters and the socialistic in Mr. Sandburg are different from what has been; and the spirit of "H. D." and Mr. Fletcher is seen in their endeavour to rediscover and reveal beauty and truth in our modern world. I am not so sure as Miss Lowell is that these poets have really captured the spirit of humanity and of truth and of beauty so that it has become the living inspiration of great poetry.

JAMES W. TUPPER.

*Lafayette College.*

---

*First Spanish Course.* By E. C. HILLS and J. D. M. FORD. Boston, D. C. Heath & Co., 1917. vi + 330 pp.

Teachers in high schools have often complained that the *Spanish Grammar* of Messrs. Hills and Ford was too formal and literary for their immature students. They cannot possibly offer that objection to the *First Spanish Course*, which is not at all a revision of the *Grammar* but a distinctly new piece of work. It is a marked improvement over the first book, from a pedagogical point of view, and is primarily intended for high-school classes. It is extremely unfortunate that the authors have not treated as fully as in the *Grammar* the introductory chapter on pronunciation, not so much for the sake of the pupils as for the teachers, most of whom are phonetically untrained, and whose knowledge of the pronunciation of Spanish is frequently incorrect. Furthermore, teachers are confronted with so many conflicting statements with regard to the pronunciation of Spanish that an exhaustive treatment of Castilian phonetics would be of great assistance to them.

One of the best features of the *First Spanish Course* is the Spanish exercises. Modern-language grammars too often lack the breath of life because the phrases in a given lesson do not follow one another in thought. They have no context; they do not train the student to think in the language which he is studying. The alternative exercises of the *Spanish Grammar* were an improvement pedagogically on the exercises in the grammar proper. The phrases

in the *First Spanish Course* are immensely superior to both of the older sets. They represent the highest point yet reached in drill exercises in American text-books on Spanish. It is no easy task to construct concatenated phrases in a grammar, especially in the first lessons where so little syntax and vocabulary are available, but in the *First Spanish Course* the authors have succeeded eminently in this difficult feat. Their English exercises too are not mere algebraic problems; they follow each other in logical sequence.

I cannot agree that the *resumen gramatical* in Spanish is of any value whatsoever. It will take a deal of explaining, for instance, to make an American student understand why, under the heading *Indicativo*, is found a form called *pretérito imperfecto (de subjuntivo)* as on page 241. Yet, if it is true that teaching is the art of repetition, the student using this book will certainly learn that nouns in *-o* are usually masculine in Spanish, a statement which he will find mentioned no less than four times, twice in English and twice in Spanish. I do not by any means wish to convey the impression that I disapprove of the plan of repeating in review lessons rules already given. The student having assimilated the normal by means of repeated drill phrases is ready later to add the abnormal in the form of exceptions. The authors have followed the most excellent plan of excluding all exceptions to the rules given in the first thirty-seven lessons. With the thirty-eighth lesson begins a review in which there is included the material previously omitted. I should like to suggest merely from a mechanical point of view a more pronounced break between lessons thirty-seven and thirty-eight.

It is a relief to find no exercises in English requiring the use of *tú* and *vosotros*. It seems to me that it is a great waste of time and energy to drill students on forms of the verb which they will never have occasion to use. The repetition of the articles *el* and *la* before each new Spanish noun is another excellent improvement which the authors have adopted. The student has the aid of both eye and ear in memorizing a new word by this method. Those who are familiar with the *Spanish Grammar* will be interested to note that the authors have kept pace with the times. The nineteenth-century horses and cows have been metamorphosed into twentieth-century automobiles and telephones. The occasional notes giving Spanish-American equivalents for Castilian words are extremely valuable to both teacher and student. Furthermore, they are high-

ly entertaining, a general characteristic of the whole book. Even a jaded instructor can sit down and read the *First Spanish Course* with genuine interest.

There is a distinct Spanish flavor to this grammar; the exercises in Spanish ring true. How often we meet in American text-books phrases which are grammatically flawless but which lack entirely the salt of Spanish! The concatenated phrases in the *First Spanish Course* might well have been spoken in the conversation of daily life in Spain or in Spanish America. The authors have used their imaginations in dramatizing situations in a background that is conspicuously Spanish. In general the book has followed the sound modern pedagogical principles of language teaching and has avoided the trivial superficialities of so many contemporaneous modern-language text-books. The superficial text-book combined with the superficially trained teacher has wrought havoc among our youth who are flocking in such numbers to study Spanish. With the *First Spanish Course*, a book that is flawlessly accurate in scholarship and pedagogically sound in method, the poorly prepared teacher of Spanish can hardly go far astray.

SAMUEL M. WAXMAN.

*Boston University.*

---

## CORRESPONDENCE

### BYRONIANA

It is possible to throw some light upon the questions raised by Mr. C. S. Northup and Mr. L. M. Buell in *Mod. Lang. Notes*, xxxii, 310 ff.

#### I

Mr. Northup describes a rare volume called *Beauties of English Poets*, published at Venice, In the Island of S. Lazzaro, 1852, in which, besides a number of Byron's "Poetries," four translations from the Armenian, some extracts from his correspondence, and the proposed preface by him to an Armenian Grammar, are a number of translations into Armenian from Milton, Pope, Gray, Keble, and Tupper. He mentions, but has not seen, what he describes as a later edition of this anthology, which (following Coleridge's Bibliography, *Byron's Works, Poetry*, vii, 149) he describes as *Lord Byron's Armenian Exercises and Poetry*, "dated on the title-page

1886 and on the yellow wrapper 1870." A copy of this little book in the Yale Library agrees with Coleridge's description with regard to the two dates but has a gray wrapper; in the copy in the New York Public Library the wrapper is green, not yellow, and both wrapper and title-page bear the date 1870. In contents these two issues are identical. They do not contain the translations from Milton, Pope, Gray, Keble, and Tupper. They contain all the selections from Byron found in the volume of 1852, with the addition, in the section devoted to Byron's "Poetries," of *On the Death of a Young Lady*, *To the Duke of Dorset*, and *On this Day I complete my Thirty-Sixth Year*. At the end is a four-page index, part English, part Armenian.

Two questions are advanced by Mr. Northup: Did Byron make the translations from Gray? and, Does Mackay's *Lord Byron at the Armenian Convent*, 1876, throw any light upon the matter? One can answer the second question unhesitatingly: it does not. George Eric Mackay's dingy little pamphlet, printed at "Venice, Office of the 'Poliglotta,'" (of which paper Mackay was editor and proprietor), was written to stir up interest in the project of the monks of S. Lazzaro to gather funds for the erection of a memorial to Byron. A copy of the work is in the Harvard Library. It is likely that the monks had been prompted to this undertaking by hearing of Disraeli's address at Willis' Rooms the previous July in which he urged the national duty of erecting a monument to Byron in London. Mackay tells in a most slovenly manner of Byron's relations with the monks, gives snatches of Armenian history and of the traditions of the convent, reprints Byron's preface to the proposed grammar, his translations from the Armenian *Corinthians*, and his Will made at Venice, and records in chapter vi "The Blind Friar's Confessions." These had been heralded at the beginning of his book as "a new chapter in the romance of Byron's life." We turn to them with interest and find that in 1868 Mackay had an interview with a blind old friar who remembered Byron. Byron, according to this witness, was beautiful "but very yellow." This fact seems to have made a deep impression on the old man, for he mumbled it several times. Byron gave him a knife which he still treasured. He was confident that Byron was now a saint in heaven. This is all! Mackay ends his book with a translation by himself of an Armenian dialogue between the Saviour and Abgar, King of the Armenians.

As for the other question, one may be certain that Mr. Northup is correct in concluding that Byron did not translate the two poems by Gray. The only pieces "done" by him are the four extracts from Armenian placed in a group by themselves. This assertion can be supported in a variety of ways. The Boston Public Library possesses a copy of the second edition of Father Paschal Augher's *Grammar Armenian and English . . .* Venice: printed at the Armenian press of St. Lazarus, 1832. The first edition had ap-

peared in 1819. In this second edition "some translations of Lord Byron from the Armenian into English" are added, viz.: the letter of the Corinthians to St. Paul, the letter from St. Paul to the Corinthians, a passage from Corenensis' *Armenian History*, and a passage from Lampronensis. These occupy pages 145-169, the English and Armenian being on opposite pages. Had the monks possessed translations *into* Armenian by Byron they would surely have been included. Moreover, several of the translations in the volume of 1852 are of too late a date to be by him, and it is fair to assume that all are from another hand or hands. Had any been by Byron they would have been put in a section by themselves and not herded together with other and later work. And it is unlikely that Byron, though he could with some assistance render Armenian into English, could make Armenian versions of English poetry. That the four items listed in the volumes of 1832, 1852, and 1870 as "Lord Byron's Translations" are all that came from his pen is proved beyond question by the fact that when the title was changed from *Beauties of English Poetry* to *Lord Byron's Armenian Exercises and Poetry* the remainder of the contents of 1852, not coming under that heading, was omitted. I do not know who translated the non-Byronic portion of the 1852-edition. Whatever little interest that problem has is not connected with Byron.

## II

Mr. Buell advances "a neat little problem in sources and origins": did Byron suggest the *Prometheus* theme to Shelley or did Shelley suggest it to Byron? He does not moot the question for the first time. I have referred to it at some length in my *Dramas of Lord Byron*, Göttingen, 1915, p. 75-77, and there give references to other discussions. My view as there expressed, is that, if it is necessary to account for Byron's renewed interest in the theme of 1816, it is more reasonable to suppose with Gillardon that that interest was due to contact with Shelley than to ascribe it (with Pughe) to the influence of Wordsworth. But I add: "I do not see that one needs more than Byron's testimony of his interest from boyhood in the theme." May I take the present opportunity to elaborate this view, answering at the same time, so far as such a question can be answered, the problem set forth anew by Mr. Buell? The number of references to the legend of Prometheus in Byron is larger than one would gather from the indices supplied by Coleridge and Prothero. See: the translation of Part of a Chorus from the "Prometheus Vinctus" (*Poetry*, 1, 14); *Monody on Sheridan*, line 56; *Ode to Napoleon*, stanza xvi; *Manfred* i, i, 154 and i, ii, 1 f.; *Don Juan* i, 27 and ii, 75; *Childe Harold* iii, 59 and iv, 63; *The Prophecy of Dante* iii, 174 f. and iv, 14 f.; *The Blues* ii, 137; *The Irish Avatar*, stanza xii; *The Age of Bronze*, line 228 f. Of these

only the first three are of a date earlier than Byron's meeting with Shelley in Switzerland; the others do not shed light on the question of priority but they show how constantly the theme was in Byron's mind and bear out his own testimony: "The *Prometheus*, if not exactly in my plan, has always been so much in my head, that I can easily conceive its influence over all or any thing that I have written" (*Letters*, iv, 174-5; cf. v, 229, 453, 470.) There is little or no evidence that the subject had been so constantly in Shelley's mind. In 1812 he asks for an *Æschylus* (*Letters*, ed. Ingpen, i, 372), but I find no mention of the Prometheus legend until October 1818 when he announces that he has finished the first act of his drama (*ibid.*, ii, 630). In the poems the word "Prometheus" occurs only in the *Prometheus Unbound*, the word "Promethean" once there and once in *Hellas*, the word "Titan" only once outside of *Prometheus Unbound* (*Gisborne*, line 24), and the word "titanic" only in *Epipschydion*. "Vulture" is used several times but not with special reference to the theme in question. It is evident from the small number of such allusions and from the fact that all such are either in the *Prometheus Unbound* or in later poems, that the subject had not in 1816 taken such hold on Shelley as on Byron. The conclusion indicated is that Byron drew upon his own resources for his *Prometheus*.

SAMUEL C. CHEW.

Bryn Mawr College.

---

#### A MOTTO OF MÉRIMÉE'S

There is a passage in the *Lettres à une Inconnue* which the critics cite constantly as indicative of Mérimée's rather cynical philosophy of life. It is a sort of *obiter dictum* in a postscript to the second of the letters given to the public. "Sachez aussi qu'il n'y a rien de plus commun que de faire le mal pour le plaisir de le faire. Défaites-vous de vos idées d'optimisme et figurez-vous bien que nous sommes dans ce monde pour nous battre envers et contre tous." Why stop here? The argument may gain by finishing the letter. Mérimée goes on: "A ce propos, je vous dirai qu'un savant de mes amis, qui lit les hiéroglyphes, m'a dit que, sur les cercueils égyptiens, on lisait très-souvent ces deux mots: *Vie, guerre*; ce qui prouve que je n'ai pas inventé la maxime que je viens de vous donner. Cela s'écrit en hiéroglyphe . . . où le premier caractère veut dire *vie*; il représente, je crois, un de ces vases appelés canopes. L'autre est une abréviation d'un bouclier avec un bras tenant une lance. *There's science for you.*" Turning now to *Colomba*, we read that Miss Lydia, wishing to fortify Orso against the evil instincts which the air of his native land might rouse in him, gives

him a ring. "Voyez-vous cette bague? C'est un scarabée égyptien trouvé, s'il vous plaît, dans une pyramide. Cette figure bizarre, que vous prenez peut-être pour une bouteille, cela veut dire *la vie humaine*. Il y a dans mon pays des gens qui trouveraient l'hiéroglyphe très bien approprié. Celui-ci, qui vient après, c'est un bouclier avec un bras tenant une lance; cela veut dire *combat, bataille*. Donc la réunion des deux caractères forme cette devise, que je trouve assez belle: *La vie est un combat*. Ne vous avisez pas de croire que je traduis les hiéroglyphes couramment; c'est un savant en *us* qui m'a expliqué ceux-là. Tenez, je vous donne mon scarabée. Quand vous aurez quelque mauvaise pensée corse, regardez mon talisman et dites-vous qu'il faut sortir vainqueur de la bataille que nous livrent les mauvaises passions. Mais, en vérité, je ne prêche pas mal." The course of the story mocks Miss Lydia's eloquence in an ironical way which must have delighted the author. The letter, cited above, is not dated, but it is hard to suppose that it did not precede the publication of *Colomba* (1840). At any rate the fact that Mérimée thus repeats himself seems to point to a peculiar fondness for this hieroglyphic motto.

BENJ. M. WOODBRIDGE

*The Rice Institute.*

---

#### A NOTE ON *Lycidas*

Where the great vision of the guarded Mount  
Looks toward Namancos and Bayona's hold.

Editors explain this last line correctly as referring to two places in Spain, but though Bayona's hold with its grand castle and noble collegiate church, said once to have belonged to the Templars, is easily found on the promontory that runs southward out of Vigo Bay, Namancos figures neither on Stieler's careful map nor in the *Monografia Geografico-Historica de Galicia*. Driving over to Finisterre last summer with the Cura of a mainland parish who serves the storm-worn church on the Cape, I put the word to him. "That is very odd of you," he answered, "for the name is not geographical at all, though topographical, but belongs to the ecclesiastical organization: it is the name of this *archiprestazgo*"—a division of the diocese including a number of parishes. Namancos, then, in Milton is simply used for Finisterre, as Iberian might be for Spanish, and the distich links, as it should, the Land's End and Finisterre, the warrior Angel with the warrior monks.

GEORGIANA GODDARD KING.

*Bryn Mawr University.*

THE SPANISH IDIOM *fondo en . . .*

The meaning of this peculiar idiom, to which Dr. S. Griswold Morley has called the attention of the readers of *Mod. Lang. Notes* (xxxii, 501 ff.), seems to be nothing else than "to speak plainly, without mincing matters" (*decirle á uno la verdad monda y lironada*), so that I should translate the instances quoted as follows: to tell the truth as an aunt would do, as an angel would do, as a girl would say, as a soothsayer, as an old cigar, as a negress, as a brother-in-law, as a jackdaw. My authority for such a translation is the well-known Portuguese expression *mundo e fundo*. It is true that it is nowadays rendered into Spanish by *mondo y lirondo*, but a nearer approach to the Portuguese may have existed.

JOSEPH DE PEROTT.

Worcester, Mass.

## A BEN JONSON ALLUSION BOOK

For the past four years Mr. J. Franklin Bradley, of the Department of English in Cornell University, has been collecting under my supervision the allusions to Ben Jonson before the year 1700. Since these allusions are nearly always accompanied by allusions to contemporary authors, and often by interesting bits of literary criticism, the collection should prove of importance to the general student of the Tudor-Stuart period. The work is now ready for the press, although its appearance will probably be delayed until the end of the war. The plan of arrangement follows in the main that of *The Shakespeare Allusion Book* as edited in two volumes, 1909, with certain modifications intended to make the material more useful to scholars.

In collecting this material Mr. Bradley has displayed great enthusiasm and industry, and has availed himself of the facilities of most of the important libraries in this country; yet it would be vain to hope that he has assembled anything like all the references to Jonson. *The Shakespeare Allusion Book*, one should remember, was a slow growth, the result of the painstaking labors of C. M. Ingleby, Miss L. Toulmin Smith, F. J. Furnivall, J. O. Halliwell-Phillipps, and, finally, of the late John Munro. As Munro states in the Preface to his handsome edition: "These volumes were not made in a day. Thirty years have passed in their compilation. Many willing hands, too, have lent their assistance. Antiquaries, scholars, and friendly readers, have all most kindly helped." Yet even so, numerous allusions to Shakespeare remained ungathered; and the

last work of Munro, published after his death on a battle-field in France, was a voluminous supplement to the *Allusion Book*.

The object of this letter is to request persons who may discover allusions to Jonson to communicate them to Mr. Bradley or to myself. If the allusions have not already been recorded, the proper acknowledgment for the discovery will be made in the footnotes. Only by the generous co-operation of all scholars interested in Jonson and Jonson's contemporaries can the work now in hand be made even approximately complete. I may add that the appearance of the volume may be confidently expected as soon as the printing trade in America returns to something like normal conditions.

JOSEPH QUINCY ADAMS.

*Cornell University.*

---

#### A SOURCE

Several months ago an anonymous editorial writer of the *Boston Herald* pointed out, under the caption of *Alleged Plagiarism*, that the plot of one of Mr. Conrad's latest stories was very similar to the plot of *A Terribly Strange Bed* written many years ago by Sheridan LeFanu. To the present generation of readers Joseph Sheridan LeFanu is hardly so much as a name; but in the 60's and early 70's he was well known as a writer of weird and horrible stories.<sup>1</sup> I have not been able to obtain a copy of all his works, but among such as have been accessible to me I do not find a story that closely resembles Mr. Conrad's *The Inn of the Two Witches*.<sup>2</sup> The short story, however, by Wilkie Collins, entitled *A Terribly Strange Bed*, published in *After Dark* (1856), is fairly familiar. Since both versions are easy to obtain I need not summarize them; but there is an interest in comparing the two methods of handling this melodramatic incident in which the canopy-top of an old-fashioned bed descends on an innocent victim to smother him.

Collins lays the scene of his version in Paris, Conrad in Spain. Collins adopts the simple autobiographic method, and seeks to

<sup>1</sup> His works are now out of print and rather hard to find. In *Notes and Queries* for January 6, 1917, Mr. Archibald Sparke mentioned a complete edition by Downey and Co., 1895-9. Cf. also *Notes and Queries*, 12 S. II, 450. The *Purcell Papers* were published posthumously in 1880 by Mr. A. P. Graves, with a brief Memoir; and *Poems* by the same editor in 1904. Several of LeFanu's stories and poems were first printed in periodicals, such as *Temple Bar* and the *Dublin University Magazine*.

<sup>2</sup> Printed in *Within the Tides*, London, 1915.

give the impression of a plain unadorned true narrative. Conrad uses the device of a discovered manuscript which is defective in part, but relates the story chiefly as an outsider, condensing the material of the "dull-faced ms." But the fundamental difference is that of emphasis. For Wilkie Collins it is par excellence the story of a strange and terrible bed; for Conrad it is a story of a young English naval officer in the Peninsular War who, suspecting that the sailor whom he has sent inland with a message may be the victim of foul play, tries to overtake him and finds him mysteriously murdered in the Archbishop's room of an inn kept by two old hags in a wild forest. Collins builds his whole story around the incident of the bed; Conrad arranges a gradual climax of terrors with the murderous bed at its summit. Collins devotes about half of the story to introduction,—the gambling den, the winnings, the old soldier. About five hundred words suffice for the actual descent of the canopy. The remainder, about one-fourth of the whole, is moralizing and explanation,—how others had probably perished in this same bed, how his coffee had been drugged too strongly, how he escaped and notified the police, and how the police raided the den and discovered the apparatus for lowering the top of the bed. Like the "well-built play," Collins's story has the climax just after the middle, and takes ample time for the resolution and conclusion. Conrad, however, in accordance with modern taste, reduces the ending to a minimum,—about one-fifteenth, as compared with Collins's one-fourth.

The main device by which Conrad seeks to increase the feeling of terror in the reader is that of having Byrne (the hero) vaguely conscious, from the moment he enters the Archbishop's room, of the presence of Cuba Tom (the sailor), who he supposes has left the inn several hours ago, but who is actually in the wardrobe, murdered. Conrad plays further on the reader's emotions by describing Byrne's "unreasoning terror" after he discovers Tom's body to be without visible marks of a struggle or any indication of how he was killed. The slow descent of the canopy when he is in this state drives him nearly to madness, so that when his friends arrive at dawn he blindly attacks them. Collins, however, by making his hero lie in a dazed stupor watching the trap close on him and then recover control barely in time to escape, gets an additional thrill of suspense which Conrad misses.

On the whole, I cannot help feeling that the apparent straightforward simplicity and directness, the air of matter-of-fact truthfulness of the earlier version make it superior to Conrad's as a tale of mystery and horror. Mr. Conrad's workmanship is more refined and delicate, the structure of his story is perhaps more artistic and effective when judged by contemporary standards; but compared with *The Terribly Strange Bed*, *The Inn of the Two Witches* seems a bit thin and diffuse, and gives the impres-

sion of a lack of unity. Indeed, in much of Mr. Conrad's work there is, besides the usual three elements of a narrative, plot, characters, and setting, a fourth, which to many readers is of paramount importance, namely his style. In reading Conrad one finds oneself delighted less with the general excellence of the meaning than with the freshness, keenness, and subtlety of his manner of setting down relatively unimportant observations. The hero of *Victory*, for example, may be, if you will, a "little Hamlet" of the South Seas. He hesitates, he is not convinced. Action is forced on him. But he lacks depth and breadth, he is not a great character, not worthy to carry a full-sized novel. What interests the reader is the subtlety and delicacy with which Conrad reveals the oscillations of his will. The unfamiliar setting also attracts us. The characterization, though slight, is conceived and handled with the utmost finesse. But the plot is tenuous and hardly adequate for so long a narrative. What holds us most is the manner of the telling; not the story, but the author behind it and visible through it. So with *The Inn of the Two Witches*: a pleasing and altogether delightful tale, but as a story of horror—its natural and inescapable category—it is inferior to the ruder, simpler narrative by Wilkie Collins.

As for the relationship of the two versions. Did Mr. Conrad take his suggestion from Collins? Or did they have a common source? Or did each invent the idea independently? Those who will, may speculate on it. Mr. Conrad may, if he likes, inform the world where he got the notion of a strange bed with a descending canopy. My interest has been to observe what two different writers make of the same material. But I know I have nearly committed the act of source-hunting. Nevertheless, I plead not guilty. Truly, if the uninitiate (and also many of the initiate) could be made to remember that what goes under the opprobrious title of *Quellenforschung* is not a Literary Branch of the Secret Service Department, is not a system for running down the criminals of the Authors' Guild, the world, or at least some part of it, would be much better off. In the minds of too many, source-hunting vaguely suggests the modern crime of plagiarism. But real plagiarism exists only among the scribblers of low degree, who bungle and degrade what they borrow. Source-hunting, however, except when it is the idle pastime of amateur scholars, *collectors* of information, is a sincere effort to understand and estimate an author in the light of what he adds of himself to the work of others. It is one way of measuring the present by the past. And so, by comparing like with like, can we judge fittingly of Mr. Conrad's story of *The Inn of the Two Witches*.

PAULL FRANKLIN BAUM.

*Harvard University.*

## SCYLD SCEFING AND HUCK FINN

The instance of divination by shield, sheaf, and candle cited by Chadwick (*Origin of the English Nation*, 278) from the Chronicle of Abingdon in support of his theory that the Scyld story is a mythologizing of the rites of an agricultural cult (a theory supported and re-enforced by Olrik, *Danmarks Hætledigtning* II, 250 ff.) had its analog in Missouri two generations ago, if we may trust the chronicler of *Tom Sawyer*, who specifically vouches in his preface for the authenticity of the folk-lore in the book. When the boys on the island realize that the firing of the gun on the ferry-boat is intended to bring their bodies—for they are believed to be drowned—to the surface, Huck Finn remarks: "They done that last summer, when Bill Turner got drownded; they shoot a cannon over the water, and that makes him come to the top. Yes, and they take loaves of bread and put quicksilver in 'em and set 'em afloat, and wherever there's anything that's drownded, they'll float right there and stop." Tom expresses the belief that it is not in the bread but in "what they say over it before they start it out" that the magic efficacy lies; but he is probably wrong. It is precisely the bread, the staff of life, the modern representative of the medieval sheaf, by which the divination is wrought. The quicksilver in place of the candle seems to be a case of metallurgy displacing medieval devotion.

H. M. BELDEN.

*University of Missouri.*

## BRIEF MENTION

*The Well of English, and the Bucket.* By Burgess Johnson (Boston, Little, Brown, & Co., 1917). The title of this book is also the title of its first chapter, which is in violation of an obviously fundamental requirement of a good title in each case. The comprehensive title of a treatise cannot logically also be descriptive of a properly marked division of the discussion, and, *vice versa*, a part should not by its name restrict the meaning of the whole. There are six more chapters: Grammar and the Bane of Boyhood; Impression and Expression; Essaying an Essay; The Right not to Laugh; The Every-Day Profanity of Our Best People; Ethics of the Pen;—head-lines these that would not discredit an alert journalist.

Mr. Johnson first attempts an assessment of the responsibility, divided between the schools and the colleges, for the too general failure to train the successive generations of students in the approved use of English. "The college throws the burden for this weakness

back upon the high school, and any teacher of English in any of our American colleges will be able to present an amusing array of exhibits to prove that great numbers of high-school graduates enter the college unable to express themselves clearly or even intelligently in writing." Not dismayed by the connotations of 'commercial value,' Mr. Johnson rightly contends that the "broad, general culture," the boast of the college, should fit a man to meet the practical tests of correctly and clearly written English. This first chapter consists chiefly in an attempt to hold the college to its duty. "If there is something lacking in the elementary training of students, then the college must immediately secure teachers of approved efficiency in teaching more elementary things. Moreover," to continue this passage in which the writer gathers himself together for the expression of what he believes to be the gist of the matter, "if you will agree that an art can best be taught by those who can themselves practice it, other requirements of a good teacher being equal, then have that in mind in selecting instructors." And the final word must be that the college "should turn out artisans, if not artists, in English, competent to handle the most essential tool in the world's workshop—their own language. This it does not at present do."

Prominently in the next chapter, on Grammar, stands the sentence: "Any form of self-expression is an art, not a science. It has no scientific rules of procedure" (p. 36). To use one's vernacular (or an acquired foreign language) is, of course, to practice an art, it is not to indulge in an application of a science; but every art is governed by a code of technicalities, by rules that constitute the science or grammar of the art. The rule of procedure in the practice of a language is to conform to its code of correctness, and the principles of correctness are codified by the scientific grammarian. Every one, therefore, speaking or writing his language is engaged in a practical art, and this practical art is capable of being raised to a higher plane; it then becomes the 'fine art' of literature. The acceptance of these postulates—and they are irrefutable—is all that is required to dispel the pedagogic confusion attending the question of what the schools and colleges should do for the student's English. The theory of education, as it is to be inferred from the methods of instruction, is especially feeble, not to say fundamentally erroneous, with respect to the relation of the art of the vernacular to purely intellectual subjects. What is wanted, and it is a national want of great importance, is the result, the cultural effect, of treating the student's language as a practical art. The subject is an art, and should be inculcated not by a method appropriate, for example, to arithmetic or geography, but by a method analogous to the method of inculcating the practice of a fine art.

The suggestion of an analogy between the acquirement of one's vernacular language and the steps in the training required, for example, to 'read' music instrumentally should give a helpful

view of the method and purpose of school-instruction in English. It is a suggestion, however, that is too subversive of elaborated school-professionalism to be widely adopted. Nor, setting aside the analogy, are the schools—from the primary grades upward into the college—easily persuaded to deal with the pupil's language as with a practical art, altho the question of how this may be done is to be inferred from the method and experiences by which children have been taught to speak while yet too young to enter school. But this is too simple for the over-stimulated mind of the professional pedagog. So important a question must, at least, be kept under discussion, and everywhere teachers convene for this purpose and argue the matter in language that does not uniformly suggest a possible application of the word art. One's language may be stupidly grammatical and yet betray no graceful gesture of mind or of voice.

To make grammar the bane of one's early years is a principal class-room abuse of the subject of English; and the reaction against 'formal grammar' is an unsound and philosophically unworthy reaction against that abuse. The art-method calls for a gradual disclosure of the principles that govern correctness, and it defers to the proper age a study of grammar as the science of the pupil's vernacular art, acquired by a dozen or more years of practice. Prejudice against grammar! It is a prejudice against the laws of the mind; and the argument from all arts is conclusive that it is a prejudice against the principles of art. A member of the editorial staff of a widely circulating periodical—he has charge of the columns devoted to the criticism of poetry—writes in his own hand "would of" (for 'would have'). This is an incredibly excessive illustration of what may, in some instances, be the intellectual preparation for an affected defense of literary art against the invasion of sound grammatical sense.

The Chapters on "Impression and Expression" and "Essaying an Essay" relate chiefly to Mr. Johnson's theories and experiences in teaching composition in college. Seemingly entirely unrelated to what may be conjectured to be the subject of the treatise is the discussion of the sense of humor in the chapter entitled "The Right not to Laugh." The pertinence of the chapter is made clearest, it will be observed, at the end of the book, in one of the author's well-matured and smoothly expressed thoughts: "Prove to me that you are able to write humorously of a man without implying your own superiority to him, and I will grant you at once a place among literary gentlefolk." There follows the chapter on profanity, which the author, keeping in his vein, might have entitled 'a cursory essay on swearing.' Here many an undisputed thing is said in a solemn way, but made applicable in a manner specifically pointed: "So gentle reader, I would say to you, if I had arbitrary power over your speech or your written correspondence (the author is

writing at Vassar College), 'This week I will allow you only two *verys'*" (may one ask, 'and how many *wills* and *woulds*?').

From the ethics of the tongue the transition is made to the "Ethics of the Pen" (the title of the closing chapter). The author discourses with knowledge and conviction on the primary rules of good conduct in journalism, and thereby gains an effective approach to the rules of good conduct in all forms of writing. Especially good is the discussion of plagiarism, "a question of false labelling"; the true code being "Honest labels on wares honestly secured" (meaning 'got,' 'obtained'). Mr. Johnson is capable of keeping hold of a thought while it leads into fine distinctions; this may be shown by a passage that will also illustrate his style: "There is no unconscious thievery. The interesting coincidences which sometimes do occur . . . do not long mislead the fairminded. There is an atmosphere about real literary theft that is unmistakable when all the arguments are heard. The writer who keeps faith with his reader, giving full credit whenever failure to do so might by any possibility mislead, being frank whenever he distrusts the spontaneity of his own invention, may go ahead with the assurance that honest critics will find little difficulty in distinguishing between crime and coincidence."

J. W. B.

---

*Recollections* by John, Viscount Morley (New York: The Macmillan Company, 1917) have been so widely reviewed that any detailed notice here is unnecessary. The primary importance of the book is in the field of political history and its reception has therefore depended in part upon the political tenets of the journals that have commented upon it. Thus the high praise of the liberal London *Nation* must be balanced against the "slashing" notice printed in, and characteristic of, *The Saturday Review*. The reminiscences of Lord Morley's terms as Chief Secretary for Ireland and of the part that he played in the decision with regard to the choice of a successor to Mr. Gladstone in 1894 are of profound interest; not less so is the publication of his letters as Secretary for India to the Viceroy, Lord Minto, during the critical period of the planning and inception of reforms in the Indian government in the direction of increased native responsibility. The publication of these letters so shortly after the event and at so critical a period in English history is, however, one would think, an astonishing indiscretion which, strangely enough, reviewers have passed over in silence. Time has not yet put to the test the real value of Lord Morley's Indian reforms; competent authorities aver that the decision to attempt nothing extreme has resulted in a half-way policy from which little good can come; and, be that as it may, these letters (printed *without* Lord Minto's replies) afford dangerous fuel to any incendiary who cares to avail himself of them. With the exception of one or two veiled suggestions Lord Morley makes no

comment upon the present catastrophe or upon England's share in the responsibility for it. But his book—the sub-title of which might well be "The Theory and Practice of Liberalism"—is an object-lesson in the need of conciliation, compromise, sympathy and understanding in the difficult art of governing men.

Lord Morley's place in literature is that of one whose endeavour it was to bridge over the solution of continuity made by the Romantic Reaction and carry on the rationalistic tendencies of the eighteenth-century Enlightenment. In his various volumes and essays on the revolutionary thinkers and statesmen of France he is thus a corrective to Carlyle. In an editorial capacity, especially during the years when he directed the *Fortnightly Review*, he played an influential part in the struggle between free thought and dogma. In his old age he now looks back upon the controversies of other years with serene satisfaction and apparently without a recognition of the part played by the men who were his allies in exalting a materialistic standard that prepared the way for future disaster. The humaneness, philanthropy, positivism of the later Victorian period is brought up into the high light; the darker tendencies involved in acceptance of theories of "race-preservation" and the like are ignored. In no mood of apology but rather with proud confidence in the verdict of history he surveys the achievement of his generation.

There is a pictorial quality almost Clarendonian in the character-drawings scattered through the *Recollections*. Mill, Meredith, Spencer, Renan, Arnold, Stephen and others, and in the world of politics, among many more, most notably Chamberlain and Harcourt, are vividly portrayed. Even more delightful are the literary "interludes," if one may so style them, that break in upon the political chronicle and mark periods of refreshment in Morley's official life. Among these the long meditation on Lucretius (ii, 118 f.) is especially noteworthy. Throughout the book one gets the impression of a mind that has "known the best that has been thought and said in the world"; the whole range of letters is covered, not only in the aptly chosen and often recondite mottoes to the various chapters, but in allusion and chance suggestion on any page of the text. There is no laborious effort to appear learned; rather it is the spontaneous overflow of a mind steeped in the best. With the mere attainment of such knowledge Morley is not satisfied; the true devotee of Culture in the wide sense in which Arnold employs the word applies it practically; his aim is more than to know the best that has been thought and said; he must "make it prevail." Such an ideal Lord Morley has had ever before his eyes.

But the highest commendation that he deserves comes to him from the quality and diversity of his friendships. The most trusted associate of Gladstone's later years, the intimate friend of George Meredith, preserving unbroken the personal ties that bound him to Joseph Chamberlain despite the triple break over Home Rule, the

Boer War, and the Tariff,—Lord Morley is a shining example of those philosophers who, in the words of Gibbon, "maintain their arguments without losing their temper, and assert their freedom without violating their friendship."

S. C. C.

---

*Simplest Spoken French* (84 pages plus a 25 page vocabulary) by W. F. Giese and Barry Cerf of the University of Wisconsin, published by Henry Holt & Co., has the merit of utility, for soldier and civilian alike. The strictly military feature is confined to a short list of terms placed near the end of the book, the attitude of the authors being "that those who study French with a view to service abroad are not going to need primarily a military vocabulary, but will require above all a command of everyday French." French pronunciation is briefly treated, with additional aid offered by specially devised phonetic symbols used throughout the vocabularies. Now, as this book is intended for schools and colleges as well as for training camps, it would seem ill-conceived to discard the international phonetic transcription in favor of a system that has little, if any advantage, over the standard. Besides, the employment of the italic vowel to represent the nasal sound and likewise the use of the accented phonogram tend to confuse the mind of the learner. The treatment of the grammar *abrégé* is praiseworthy; the irregular verbs given are confined to those in most common use; and the brief sentences in the dialogues are sprightly and idiomatic, such as a tyro might conceivably handle with ease. Naturally, there are no set exercises, but frequent drills are suggested for varying on the use of pronoun, verb, etc., in each conversation preceding. This clear presentation gives an impression of the union of method and motive undiscoverable in many of the books put forth under the spur of the present crisis, to which are now to be added the following:

*War French*, prepared by Col. Cornélis de Witt Willcox, Professor of Modern Languages at the U. S. Military Academy, West Point, and published by the Macmillan Co., containing chapters in English on French institutions, civil and military, a brief treatment of French grammar, conversations, chiefly on military matters, and a complete vocabulary.

*French for Soldiers* (130 pages) by Arthur F. Whittem and Percy W. Long, published by the Harvard University Press. It gives the elements of French grammar, selected passages from the French Military Manual, with an interlinear translation for the aid of beginners, and a number of examples of the picturesque slang of the *poilu*. The collaboration of the officers of the Military Mission and of Captain Baldensperger, now exchange professor at Columbia University, assures the authority and accuracy of this little book.

R. A. S.